United Nations S/PV.7802

Security Council

Seventy-first year

Provisional

7802nd meeting

Monday, 7 November 2016, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Ndiaye/Mr. Ciss	(Senegal)
Members:	Angola	Mr. Gaspar Martins
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	Egypt	Mr. Aboulata
	France	Mr. Delattre
	Japan	Mr. Bessho
	Malaysia	Mr. Ibrahim
	New Zealand	Mr. Van Bohemen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Spain	Mr. Ybáñez
	Ukraine	Mr. Klimkin/Mr. Vitrenko
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Rycroft
	United States of America	Ms. Power
	Uruguay	Mr. Rosselli
	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Mr.Ramirez Carreño

Agenda

Maintenance of international peace and security

Peace operations facing asymmetrical threats

Letter dated 27 October 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2016/927)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. *Corrections* should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org).

16-36375 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Maintenance of international peace and security

Peace operations facing asymmetrical threats

Letter dated 27 October 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2016/927)

The President (*spoke in French*): I wish to warmly welcome the Deputy Secretary-General, Ministers and other representatives present in the Security Council Chamber. Their presence today underscores the importance of the subject matter under discussion.

In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand and Turkey to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the following briefers to participate in this meeting: Ms. Michaëlle Jean, Secretary-General of the International Organization of la Francophonie; Mr. Yury Fedotov, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; Mr. Jean-Paul Laborde, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate; and Mr. Arthur Boutellis, Director of the Brian Urquhart Center for Peace Operations.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the following to participate in this meeting: His Excellency Mr. Joao Vale de Almeida, Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations; His Excellency Mr. Tanou Koné, Permanent Observer of the Economic Community of West African States to the United Nations; and His Excellency Mr. Téte António, Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2016/927, which contains a letter dated 27 October 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Senegal addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a concept paper on the item under consideration.

I now give the floor to the Deputy Secretary-General.

The Deputy Secretary-General: I thank the Government of Senegal for organizing this timely and important meeting.

Today, our peace operations increasingly face asymmetric threats from violent extremists and terrorist groups. The casualty figures in Mali are a stark and tragic reflection of that. It is a sad fact that our peacekeepers are now being specifically targeted by violent extremists and terrorists. Yesterday again, our peacekeepers in Mali came under attack. One of them died, seven others were wounded, and two Malian civilians were also killed by the unknown assailants. The Secretary-General condemns this vicious acts, underlining that such attacks targeting United Nations peacekeepers may constitute war crimes under international law.

If United Nations peace operations are to be able to work safely and carry out their mandates in today's complex conflicts, they must develop strategies to face these new conditions. The fundamental question is how they can do so. Today's discussion could be very helpful in answering that question, and we thank you, Sir, for this initiative.

We should first recall that the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations emphasized that United Nations troops should not undertake military counter-terrorism operations. One conclusion could be that peacekeeping operations should not be mandated to militarily defeat violent extremist and terrorist groups. However, terrorists and violent extremists are a reality in many contemporary conflicts — a reality that has to be dealt with. These destructive and dangerous forces make conflicts even more intractable. They thrive on impunity and governance failures. They exploit deep-rooted grievances. These factors in turn are fertile ground for violent extremism and terrorism to grow further.

This is the context in which the United Nations often must operate. In response, our action and footprint have to be more nimble and comprehensive, and we need more flexible support arrangements. We will need more sophisticated and more predictable uniformed capabilities to strengthen mobility, responsiveness and a deeper understanding of the operating environment. Developing our intelligence and analysis capacity will be critical in that pursuit. We will also need to adjust how we conduct our core tasks, including our good offices, our capacity-building, our community engagement and stabilization measures — all the tools that are available to the United Nations.

Further, the political objectives of our peacekeeping operations need to be clearly defined and communicated. We must find new and creative ways of achieving political goals in situations where some parties are not speaking partners or willing participants, and we must devise strategies to build coalitions and support around political objectives at the local, national and regional levels.

I see three priorities for preparing our operations to face asymmetric threats.

First and primarily, we must do all we can to ensure the safety and security of our personnel. This means greater situational awareness, analysis and force protection measures. We are already doing that in Mali, but we need to do more. We must, for instance, utilize new technologies and deploy uniformed units with built-in, robust self-protection tools.

Secondly, we must adapt how we deliver our mandates. The fact that the United Nations is a potential target should encourage us to think more deeply about how we are to operate in this new, more dangerous and unpredictable environment. Support for the peaceful resolution of conflicts should be grounded in a nuanced understanding of who the different parties are, how they are resourced and who their allies are. That varies from case to case. An overgeneralized approach can be counterproductive and possibly expose the United Nations to more risk. In such environments we should also think beyond a security-focused approach. The entirety of the tools at the disposal of the United Nations should be considered, including sanctions regimes, normative instruments, capacity-building, stabilization and development aid. We must build State capacity that is accountable, legitimate and respects human rights and the rule of law, so as to avoid perpetuating drivers of conflict and extremism in the first place.

Thirdly, we must fully take into account how and when the United Nations can support national and regional efforts to prevent violent extremism and terrorism. In his Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, the Secretary-General indicated the need to integrate the prevention of violent extremism in peace operations, both in terms of mandates and the relevant activities of the United Nations country teams. The General Assembly has called on Member States to implement the recommendations of the Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism as they apply to the national context. When requested, the United Nations is ready to support such efforts at the national level. We are providing technical assistance in areas such as criminal justice, border controls, kidnapping for ransom, dealing with foreign terrorist fighters and the financing of terrorism. We are also supporting youth engagement and skills development. And we are encouraging Member States to exchange information among themselves, as well as expertise and resources, in order to strengthen international cooperation on countering terrorism. One important tool to provide all-United Nations strategic assistance is the integrated assistance for countering terrorism initiative for the Group of Five for the Sahel, mandated by the Council in 2014.

I would like to conclude with a final reflection. The United Nations is an Organization of States, but it is also an Organization of normative values. We work for the peoples of the world. Our mandate is built around inclusion, not exclusion. Over the past few years, Member States came together in an impressive display of unity to develop a blueprint for peace, sustainable development and dignity for all on a healthy planet. The 2030 Agenda recognizes that all our challenges and all our opportunities are interdependent and mutually reinforcing. Another important tool in our hands, on which I would like to congratulate Member States, are the identical resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on peacebuilding and sustaining peace (resolution 2282 (2016) and General Assembly resolution 70/262). This innovative concept opens up several avenues towards a comprehensive response to many of the threats we face in today's world. If — and it is a big "if" — we implement the 2030 Agenda and use the full potential of the sustaining peace resolutions the Council and Assembly have adopted, discussions like

the one we are having today will hopefully be much less urgent and much less necessary than they are today.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Ms. Jean.

Ms. Jean (*spoke in French*): We were cruelly confronted by the news of the two attacks that took place in quick succession yesterday and the day before in Mali, which claimed the life of a French soldier in a mine explosion and that of a Togolese peacekeeper in an ambush that also injured seven other persons, three of them critically. We are gathered here aware of the ultimate sacrifice made by men and women deployed in the field in the service of peace. We here are driven by the same determination and urgency and the same ideal enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations Charter in 1945, namely,

> "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace".

Through those words, the Security Council's road map — our road map — can be more clearly traced.

I would like to commend you, Mr. President — Foreign Minister Mankeur Ndiaye — and your country, Senegal, which currently holds the presidency of the Security Council as well as the chairmanship of the Summit of La Francophonie, for taking the initiative to convene this high-level debate, which is so crucial for the conduct of peacekeeping operations in the face of what have been called unprecedented asymmetrical threats. This initiative also reflects Senegal's very active role at the helm of the Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, and more generally its major, and appreciated, commitment to peacekeeping operations, including those deployed in francophone countries. I would also like, through you, Mr. President, to thank Senegal for the trust it places in the International Organization of La Francophonie (IOF), as reflected in its invitation for me to participate here today. This is a historic moment for us.

I am here today as the Secretary-General of La Francophonie, an international organization made up of 80 States and Governments from five continents. The francophone world today accounts for half of all United Nations peacekeeping operations throughout the world. Fifty-five member States and observers of our organization are engaged in peacekeeping operations today — indicating that we too have recognized the urgent need to adapt peacekeeping operations in terms of their mandates and resources in the face of the new threats confronting them.

We in the IOF can see those threats every day: in Mali, Lebanon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Central African Republic, and even in the end-of-mandate operations in Côte d'Ivoire. The threats are permanent. They have an impact both on peacekeepers and the mandate of peacekeeping operations as well as when it comes to protecting civilians and securing territory, boundaries and personnel.

We are shocked by recurrent attacks against peacekeepers in Mali, which we condemn in the strongest terms. And, as we know, bordering countries are not spared. We saw recently how the army of the Niger fell victim to an attack by criminal militias on 6 October, when 22 soldiers who were providing security at a site for Malian refugees in the Tahoua region, which borders Mali, were killed in broad daylight.

The President of the Niger, still in shock when I called him, did not fail to tell me what the subregion wanted, that is, that in carrying out its mandate, the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) act more tactically and robustly and in a more concerted and coordinated manner with the affected countries in order to use force in the spirit of Article I of the Charter, which I mentioned earlier, so as to prevent and remove threats to the peace and to suppress all acts of aggression. As La Francophonie is always quick to recall, this is about our absolute responsibility to protect, by all means, populations exposed to danger.

We often find ourselves helpless in the face of the deadly attacks perpetrated by these criminal groups, which use every cruel and cowardly means to destabilize already weak countries. To defeat these criminal groups, whose goal is to control routes and passages so as to facilitate trafficking in drugs, arms and human beings, we must foil their plans and counter their actions by means of more collective and thus more effective efforts. We can do this only if we work together in the context of a joint effort that involves the international community together with the States concerned and those of the subregion. We need also to strengthen the capacity of said States to act and fully

participate in defending their territory and protecting their peoples.

I have repeatedly conveyed to the international community, and to the Security Council in particular, the pressing appeals of the countries in the Lake Chad Basin region for additional resources, in the form of technical and logistical support, for the Multinational Joint Task Force in the fight to put an end to the deadly attacks by Boko Haram against isolated, extremely vulnerable communities. Yes, efforts have been made, and I wish to commend them. Here I am thinking in particular of the more modern, sophisticated equipment provided to the troops; the priority given to intelligence-gathering; and the strengthening in recent months of the mandate of certain operations, including MINUSMA, the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic, so that they can better protect civilians and withstand the attacks of armed groups. But we see also how difficult it has been to implement resolution 2295 (2016).

All of these difficulties and shortcomings, and sometimes even dysfunctions, of which we are fully aware, are a source of serious concern for the IOF, because for 20 years we have been actively and concretely cooperating with our international partners, primarily the United Nations, in crisis prevention and conflict prevention and resolution, and supporting countries as they seek to consolidate peace and democracy. The French-speaking space has become a kind of laboratory for peacekeeping operations. Given our presence on the ground at all stages of the continuum of peace, our widely acknowledged experience and expertise in fragile political, security and socioeconomic contexts, we welcome the high priority given to crisis prevention and peacebuilding in the framework of the global peacekeeping reform undertaken by the United Nations in 2015.

It is in that same spirit that we call for the continuation, and even the strengthening, of the civilian dimension of peacekeeping operations, which represents a pivotal element of stabilization in countries emerging from crisis and in transition situations. This is part and parcel of the preventive approaches promoted by the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism.

I believe that we are all on the same page. A security approach is necessary but not sufficient. As I said at the international conference convened by the IOF in June on countering terrorism and the prevention of violent extremism, we must also respond to the determined attacks against us with our own determination to strike back, using all of our weapons of mass construction: education, training for all, job creation and investment in economic initiatives for women and for youth, so as to bring about sustainable, equitable development. We also have to create a deep-rooted culture of democracy and peace and strengthen rule-of-law institutions as well as respect for rights and freedoms.

Ensuring such freedoms is a joint endeavour. I wish to stress also the importance of respecting freedom of speech and freedom of the press, which are key to a climate of peace. I have just been informed by the highest authorities of Radio France Internationale of the jamming of its FM signal as well as that of Radio Okapi, the United Nations radio station in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This is just one example. Such incidents are worrisome and must be avoided so as to preserve freedom of the press and of speech. The IOF's approach to its work in all the areas I have just mentioned involves shared responsibility.

Turning to the security dimension, we support unreservedly the Council's desire to make peacekeeping operations safer and more robust and increase their level of performance. On the basis of the conclusions of the June IOF conference, to which my dear friend Mr. Jean-Paul Laborde made a valuable contribution, I wish also to underscore the need to strengthen cooperation in terms of intelligence-gathering, because it is clear that while peacekeeping operations cannot be anti-terrorist actors as they currently stand, they can and must be provided the resources to better face the new threats they face and contribute, at various levels, to minimizing them.

To that end, Blue Helmets must be better equipped, better prepared and better trained, and the IOF is contributing to that endeavour. Our experience in the French-speaking world has shown us that it is vital that personnel deployed on the ground be able to gather information, hear witness statements and communicate in French with the local authorities and population. They must also have a solid grasp of the historical, political, socioeconomic and cultural realities. The operations' security and ability to perform are at stake, in particular as concerns the civilian dimension. This is

particularly important at a time when terrorist strategies are based on the capacity of these criminal groups to infiltrate and melt into local populations. Also at stake is dialogue and the climate of confidence that must be established. Let us not underestimate this dimension.

I reiterate here the call I made at the Paris ministerial conference on peacekeeping operations in French-speaking environments a few days ago: that every effort must be made to strengthen the use of French within the Secretariat and in theatres of operation in French-speaking countries. We therefore call for greater participation by the States members of the IOF and for the greater recruitment of French-speaking personnel in peacekeeping operations. We also support a greater expansion of United Nations recruitment activities to French-speaking populations. Here I would pay tribute to Mr. Atul Khare and Mr. Hervé Ladsous for the very close cooperation that the IOF has been enjoying with the Department of Field Support and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, which has allowed us to achieve encouraging results. For example, 99 per cent of MINUSCA police are French-speaking.

A great deal needs to be done. That is why we have developed a French teaching method for non-French-speaking defence and security forces, in cooperation with the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Experience has shown also that in certain Member States it is vital to better train and prepare deployed personnel and Blue Helmets so as to enable them to more effectively address the new threats facing them. That is why we regularly support francophone training centres for peacekeeping operations. That is also why, as my dear colleague Hervé Ladsous is well aware, we have a network of French-speaking military, police and civilian capacities through our Francophone Expertise and Training Network for Peace Operations, which acts as the umbrella organization for francophone training centres and provides information, in French, on peacekeeping, mobilizing for that purpose a sizeable community of experts.

Experience has shown that it is vital to increase security in the environments in which peacekeeping operations are deployed. That is the goal of the assistance we provide to our member States to help them build their capacity to fight terrorism, as Mr. Jean-Paul Laborde well knows, given that the IOF is cooperating with the Counter-Terrorism Committee to promote the ratification by national Governments of universal, regional and subregional instruments to counter terrorism and crime. We are also strengthening the capacities of specialized francophone judges and prosecutors.

All the crises, conflicts and new threats that we have to face, wherever they are, concern all of us without exception, and call for a concerted and coordinated approach on our part for which we pool our capacities, experience, resources and means, whether that is in the context of our cooperation with the United Nations, our bilateral, multilateral, regional or subregional cooperation, or our cooperation with institutional stakeholders and civil society. The Council should rest assured that the OIF will continue to promote that essential integrated approach with all its partners, including the United Nations, and that it can and should count on us.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Ms. Jean for her briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Fedotov.

Mr. Fedotov (*spoke in French*): I welcome today's debate in the Council, designed to promote effective action against the challenges that peacekeeping operations are dealing with in the form of asymmetric threats. One of those challenges, as the Council is aware, is the ties that exist between terrorists and criminal networks in many parts of the world. In Afghanistan, drug traffickers pay the Taliban for protection. In the Middle East, the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant profits from trading and illicit trafficking in cultural goods and oil and from kidnappings for ransom. Criminals in West Africa pay terrorists' travel expenses in order to secure routes used for human trafficking and for smuggling migrants, arms, drugs and tobacco through the Sahel and the Sahara to Europe. In Nigeria, Boko Haram directs a network of highly profitable criminal activities, while in Somalia, Al-Shabaab has received tens of millions of dollars from illegal exports of charcoal and piracy. Because of this, peacekeeping missions dealing with terrorists and violent extremists can find themselves in dangerous situations.

I commend the Secretary-General for his establishment in late October of the High-level Action Group on Preventing Violent Extremism, which has been working on a plan of action to counter that threat. Based on that approach, the Working Group of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF) has identified 12 recommendations for implementation by the United Nations, with the goal

of preventing violent extremism, sharing best practices and supporting Member States' efforts.

The efforts of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) are aimed at implementing several capacity-building projects designed to improve criminal justice systems and promote the rule of law. There are 20 projects within the framework of the CTITF plan for preventing violent extremism that UNODC is working on with its partners, and a large number of those are related to strengthening good governance and the rule of law. UNODC efforts seek to strengthen criminal justice preventive measures, including preventing radicalization and prison violence; reinforce approaches based on maintaining human rights and the rule of law in combating terrorism; prevent the recruitment of terrorists, especially foreign terrorist fighters, including through the Internet; support policies and programmes for victims of terrorism; and help to develop national and regional action plans for preventing violent extremism.

Many of those efforts are happening in Africa, particularly in the Sahel and countries in West, North and East Africa. UNODC is partnering with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) in order to deal more effectively with such threats. All UNODC activity in Africa is supported by our field office network, working according to priorities, established by Member States and African regional organizations, that are central to the three new regional programmes launched this year for West Africa, North Africa, the Middle East and East Africa. In West Africa, our regional programme is aligned with the action plan of the Economic Community of West African States and the priorities of the countries in the region. In that context, our Sahel programme is helping to strengthen national criminal justice systems' capacity to combat drug- and arms-smuggling, organized crime, terrorism, money laundering and corruption, and represents UNODC's contribution to the United Nations Integrated Strategy for the Sahel. In that regard, we are cooperating closely with the United Nations Office for West Africa and the Sahel (UNOWAS) and the Group of Five for the Sahel. We are also working with the UNOWAS Department of Political Affairs, DPKO and INTERPOL, our partners in the implementation of the West Africa Coast Initiative, which has led in particular to the creation of anti-transnational-crime units that have enabled major drug seizures and their effective prosecution.

UNODC and its partners will continue to combat the threats of terrorism, violent extremism and all the challenges surrounding them. We will continue to support peacekeeping operations and Member States and to promote equitable criminal justice systems and the rule of law in the context of peaceful and inclusive societies, in support of Goal 16 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Fedotov for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Laborde.

Mr. Laborde (*spoke in French*): The terrorist threat currently appears in at least three different forms — first, through the organizations on the Council's list that control territory, as in Syria, Iraq, Somalia, Libya, Nigeria and Mali; secondly, by making a deadly reality of a violent ideology that inspires terrorist attacks around the world; and lastly, as a real threat to vulnerable States and to global peace and security, as was put very well by the Deputy Secretary-General, whom I thank for his extremely clear comments in that regard and for his presence here today. As regards the third form of the threat, terrorist groups take every opportunity afforded by local and regional conflicts that weaken State structures and the rule of law — and, by extension, human rights — to expand their terrorist activities, including by taking control of vast territories.

The conflicts I just referred to are specifically found in the geographical areas where the vast majority of United Nations peacekeeping missions are deployed. In fact, it could be estimated that two thirds of the officers and soldiers participating in peacekeeping operations currently operate in the areas affected by terrorism. In such circumstances, it should be noted that it is not only the citizens of the countries concerned who are affected by asymmetric threats, but, unfortunately, United Nations personnel as well. The attacks of yesterday and the day before, and those perpetrated in October in Mali, are just some of the most recent examples.

As long as terrorists and their organizations continue to spread fear and horror by such attacks, the residents of those countries and United Nations staff and compounds will be among their targets. The close relationship of local or regional conflicts with terrorism, violent extremism and — I thank the Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Mr. Yury Fedotov, for mentioning

it — organized crime is today an unprecedented threat to international peace and security. Let us never forget those three components: terrorism, violent extremism and organized crime. That relationship puts United Nations peacekeeping missions in a situation of new and growing vulnerability.

The Security Council set up the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) in a very interesting manner as a special political mission tasked with addressing specific terrorism-related threats to peace and security. That element brings a special perspective to our debate. CTED and the peacekeeping operations are partners in the Security Council, and their respective mandates, while completely different, are mutually reinforcing. I insist on the fact that their mandates are distinct because it could be dangerous to conflate them.

Under the guidance of the Committee, the main task of CTED is to conduct independent assessments of Member States' capacity to fight terrorism, in accordance with resolution 1373 (2001), which remains valid, although it was adopted after the 2001 attacks in New York. Subsequent Council resolutions on counter-terrorism — such as resolution 1624 (2005), which addresses the prohibition of incitement to commit terrorist acts, as well as acts of terrorism motivated by intolerance or extremism, or, more recently, resolution 2178 (2014), on foreign terrorist fighters and the fight against violent extremism — are clear illustrations of the links and the working capacities.

On the one hand, we are perfectly aware that the two mandates — one that focuses on peacekeeping and the other on the fight against terrorism — are not similar, but they are complementary. Ultimately, that approach of complementarity will improve the protection of civilians in the framework of United Nations peacekeeping operations. On the other hand, it is clear that the United Nations peacekeeping operations and special political missions are deployed on the ground. I refer to the special political missions, whose leader is here with us today — Mr. Jeffrey Feltman, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs — because that element should not be neglected in today's debate.

Therefore, both types of operations — peacekeeping operations and special political missions — are on the front line and thus must strengthen the institutional capacity of the forces of order, including border control, which is a major problem in lawless areas. They must also strengthen criminal justice capacities so as to bolster the rule of law, as the Secretary General of the International Organization of la Francophonie mentioned, and the authorities and services that are essential to combating terrorism and organized crime and, equally, to promoting institutional development. Thus, given their vast experience in fragile countries, where State structures are challenged, peacekeeping operations and special political missions are in a unique position to assist such countries in strengthening their operational capacity under the rule of law. In addition, they can provide special support, day by day, to the States most affected by terrorism.

For more than a decade now, CTED has been building a set of best practices in the fight against terrorism, according to the principles of the rule of law. Those best practices, which have been adopted by the Counter-Terrorism Committee, have been identified by a consistent methodology and ongoing dialogue with Member States and with more than 50 international and regional organizations, particularly the International Organization of la Francophonie. The Secretary General of that organization mentioned that I participated in its meeting in June, and I will gladly talk about this issue at its next summit, which will be held in a few days.

The United Nations system is also at the centre of the issue, particularly the Council and its Counter-Terrorism Committee, whose political leadership must be commended. We need that leadership in our actions, including this year under the chairmanship of the Ambassador of Egypt, who is present here today and with whome have a very close relationship. I thank the Ambassador for his chairmanship and the way in which he steers our work with all the political guidance that is required.

These best practices are based on specific Security Council resolutions and — we too often forget — the 19 international legal counter-terrorism instruments. That is the international cooperation in criminal matters. We should never forget that because it is the basis on which work on the rule of law is conducted at the global level. If we want the rule of law to be our priority, then let us speed up the systems of international cooperation in criminal matters. CTED, in conjunction with UNODC, is quite ready to assist the Council in that regard. Thanks to such cooperation, we were able to integrate the principles of the rule of law and the elements required for the protection of human rights in our work.

Moreover, CTED has conducted more than 100 evaluation visits in the Member States, including follow-up visits. Following those visits, we provided recommendations and identified best practices, which have been approved by all parties concerned and by the Counter-Terrorism Committee. The Committee and its Executive Directorate have a Security Council mandate to assist States to combat terrorism and violent extremism. I must mention the coordination efforts carried out by the Secretary-General's Task Force headed by Mr. Jeffrey Feltman. I will speak about that issue a bit later.

Robust information-sharing already exists, but we must do more for the mutual reinforcement of the two mandates, to assess operational capacity and best practices, on one hand, and peacekeeping operations, on the other. This is what the Deputy Secretary-General referred to when he spoke of the One United Nations approach. It means that coordination and information-sharing with other United Nations counter-terrorism organizations, including in the office of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, represented here by its Chair, Mr. Feltman, and the team itself. That team encompasses all the entities that comprise the Task Force, particularly the UNODC, the United Nations Development Programme and the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team that assists the Committee pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999), 1989 (2011) and 2253 (2015) concerning ISIL (Da'esh), Al-Qaida,and associated individuals, groups, undertakings and entities, which is chaired by our colleague from New Zealand. Such bodies must all work together to support peacekeeping operations.

I must not forget the guiding principles on foreign terrorist fighters adopted in Madrid. I thank the Spanish Secretary of State, who organized that meeting last year very well. The meeting provided key reference points for enhancing institutional cooperation, including on the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

The Deputy Secretary-General spoke of the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism. I am also pleased to refer to the high-level action group on that topic, which is chaired by the Secretary-General and held its first meeting last week. I should also mention our excellent cooperation with the Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. Our regular and comprehensive exchange of information with that Office has led to a fruitful integration of our collective knowledge and has been reflected in activities of importance to both sides — the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and CTED — and ensures that we implement a common strategy in our work.

In conclusion, allow me to contribute to this debate by suggesting to the Council three points of reflection in the framework of the larger debate on peace and security and asymmetric threats.

First, CTED can continue to offer our expertise in the realm of counter-terrorism, particularly in our assessments of the needs and capacities of States to deal with counter-terrorism. We share good practices, as well as our recommendations with respect to technical assistance, so that the United Nations can work together in the realm of peacekeeping operations.

Secondly, in following our recommendations ountries and missions require increased technical assistance because the recommendations may be sound but they need to be implemented on the ground. I would wish to see a more significant approach to security, criminal justice, international cooperation, particularly through the effective implementation of the aforementioned international instruments, including those relating directly or indirectly to the fight against terrorism, as well as through the promotion of best practices, in order to strengthen the capacity of States and regions. That is a clear need. Perhaps we are pushing against an open door, but it needs to be said.

Thirdly, how can we ensure such capacity-building through our peacekeeping operations, if they request it? We need close coordination and better exchange of information among the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate, the Special Envoys and Representatives of the Secretary-General, the Department of Political Affairs, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme and the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council, without forgetting the cooperation bodies, such as the Center on Global Counterterrorism Cooperation, and the specialized organizations, particularly those on the ground, such as the International Organization of la Francophonie, represented here by its Secretary-General, and the League of Arab States, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the European Council, the European Union, and so on. We must work

in a coordinated way so that, at the end of the day, we can ensure that we work together with other bodies through bilateral assistance. That is because bilateral assistance, which is so important in the areas that we are discussing, must be executed in a coordinated manner.

I cannot close without thanking you, Mr. President, both as the representative and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal and you personally, for having convened this debate and enabling the consistency and coherence of our actions in all areas of our work. We will continue to bear in mind what Albert Camus said in his acceptance speech for the Nobel Prize in literature, namely, that we know very well that we will not go far with respect to the hopes of our societies but at least we will conserve our societies and our values. That is what we must continue to do together while focusing on the common values of the United Nations.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Laborde for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Boutellis. **Mr. Boutellis**: Let me first thank everyone on behalf of the International Peace Institute (IPI) for the opportunity to present the results of some of the research and convening work that our think tank has done over the past year on challenges facing peace operations operating in countries confronting asymmetric threats, including terrorist attacks.

Think tanks like ours help policymakers make informed decisions on emerging issues by offering practical, research-based ideas and by stimulating debates on how best to operationalize those ideas. The IPI report, which serves as a basis for this briefing, entitled *Waging Peace: United Nations Peace Operations Confronting Terrorism and Violent Extremism*, which I co-authoured with Naureen Chowdhury Fink, was produced by IPI and the Global Centre on Cooperative Security and is the result of extensive conversations with United Nations officials, representatives of Member States and practitioners, as well as field research carried out over the past year.

Of the 11 countries most affected by terrorism and other asymmetric threats globally, seven currently host United Nations peace operations, which range from small special political missions to larger peacekeeping operations. The deployment of peace operations in countries where there may be little or no peace to keep and where terrorist attacks are part of the landscape of threats, adds to the complexity of the challenges facing the United Nations system, Member States and national and local partners.

To date, the discourse among experts and policymakers on peace operations operating in asymmetric-threat environments has focused narrowly on two key issues. First, it has focused on whether peacekeeping operations can undertake kinetic counter-terrorism operations. On that, the 2015 High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations and the follow-up report of the Secretary-General concluded that United Nations peace operations are not the appropriate tool for military counter-terrorism operations (see S/2015/446).

Secondly, it has also focused on the range of capabilities and the posture required to protect civilians in complex security environments and to improve the safety and security of United Nations personnel on the ground. Establishing missions in such environments has costs, both human and financial, that we must bear in mind. While it is indeed essential for the United Nations to adapt its mission presence and activities when operating in such environments, the practical question before us is how to adapt while upholding the spirit and letter of the doctrinal principles that have governed United Nations peacekeeping thus far. It is clear that retreating behind secure compounds, known as bunkerization, is not the solution to the dilemma. There has, however, been comparatively little exploration of the broader political and practical challenges, opportunities and risks facing United Nations peace operations in such complex environments. That has created a gap between the policy debate here in New York and the realities confronting United Nations staff on the ground.

The three major United Nations peace and security reviews in 2015 all highlighted the need for United Nations peace operations to adapt to the changing nature of conflicts. They also emphasized the primacy of political solutions for preventing and ending conflicts and for sustaining peace. That emphasis on prevention came up in the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism and during the review of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Both underscore the limitations of securitized approaches alone, approaches that focus on symptoms rather than causes and advocate for greater investment in preventive multi-stakeholder strategies. That is the added value of the United Nations. Therefore, the IPI report seeks to expand the scope of the discussions

beyond whether peace operations can adapt to asymmetric threat environments to how they can better implement their mandates and support national Governments and local communities in the face of terrorism and violent extremism.

That raises a number of key questions relating to whether, where, when and how preventive approaches could and should be integrated into the mandates of peace operations and how to capacitate United Nations field missions as a consequence. Can it be done in a context of limited resources and expertise without impairing their impartiality or complicating relations with host countries? Can it be done while ensuring the safety and security of staff? And critically, how should the issue of fragmented policy development at United Nations Headquarters and the resulting lack of clear guidance and resources for field missions be addressed?

Allow me to highlight a few key recommendations the report puts forward for how peace operations could adopt more cohesive and strategic approaches to addressing the threat of terrorism and violent extremism, which shape a number of asymmetrical threat environments.

First, United Nations peace operations need to develop a more nuanced understanding, not only of terrorist groups, but also of the drivers and grievances leading to radicalization and violence, as well as of local capacities for peace and resilience. This will require better and more real-time information and analysis, including regional analytical frameworks in some contexts.

Secondly, greater coherence and clearer policy guidance on these issues are needed. This requires continued United Nations system-wide discussions not only between United Nations counter-terrorism bodies and peace operations teams, of course, but also among Member States and across the three pillars of the Organization's work. In this regard, mandates and structures should not be an obstacle to either United Nations system-wide collaboration or to adopting more strategic approaches to addressing the drivers of asymmetrical threats without securitizing those mandates.

Thirdly, it is important that United Nations peace operations preserve and expand the space for dialogue with all parties to a conflict. Security Council sanctions do not legally bar United Nations actors from talking to listed armed groups and their leaders, and there should not be an a priori branding of who is a legitimate or illegitimate interlocutor without a balanced analysis of who they are and whether dialogues or alternative strategies may bear fruit.

Fourthly, United Nations peace operations should have honest conversations with host Governments about what the United Nations does not do to fight against asymmetrical threats, including terrorism, and where the United Nations can add value and support Member States' priorities in preventing terrorism, including in the areas the rule of law, security institutions and human rights, and in advising on national strategy development, including on which national counter-terrorism measures can be counterproductive. Peace operations should also encourage host nations to address the conditions conducive to the spread of violent extremism, including by promoting better governance and State-citizen relations.

Fifthly and finally, while more empirical evidence is needed to fully understand the impact and potential of preventive initiatives, peace operations could already start mainstreaming some of these initiatives as part of context-specific integrated mission strategies for preventing and sustaining a piece. While doing so, it should adopt a do-no-harm approach and exercise caution in the use of labels.

In conclusion, the added value of the United Nations in helping to address asymmetrical threats is not to deliver a decisive military response, but to support and strengthen preventive multi-stakeholder approaches to sustaining peace. This timely thematic debate will hopefully help the Organization develop a more strategic and integrated approach to waging and sustaining peace, rather than only protecting an instrument to better manage the symptoms of asymmetrical threats. I submit that the continued relevance of the United Nations should be judged by the former not the latter.

The President (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank Mr. Arthur Boutellis for his briefing.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad.

This morning's debate is perhaps one of the most important discussions the Security Council has ever had. Indeed, one year after the submission of the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (S/2015/446) and the subsequent report of

the Secretary-General (S/2015/682), it is time for us to grapple with one of the most complex challenges that peacekeeping missions still face: asymmetrical threats. This phenomenon, which threatens the lives of civilians and undermines the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations from Africa to the Middle East, deserves particular focus and attention, in particular on the part of the Security Council.

It is against this backdrop that the President of the Republic of Senegal, His Excellency Mr. Macky Sall, has taken the initiative of convening this high-level debate in order to strategically reflect on peace operations facing asymmetrical threats in order to consider the need to adapt the tools on which the Organization's peace and security architecture rests.

I would like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General, the Secretary-General of the International Organization of la Francophonie, the Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, the Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and the Director of the Brian Urquhart Center for Peace Operations for their relevant briefings, which speak volumes about the severity of the phenomenon we are considering today and the options we have in countering that threat.

We must agree that the international security order has completely changed in today's world with the proliferation of violent internal conflicts, as a result of the emergence of large numbers of non-State actors, including terrorist groups. This is especially true when we see the worrying trend of conflicts and the emergence of new cross-cutting and asymmetrical threats, ranging from terrorism to transnational organized crime, which continues to mark the current environment.

From northern Mali to Afghanistan, through the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic and the Middle East, criminal groups regularly target United Nations staff and civilian populations, in particular those most vulnerable: women and children. The examples of this in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA), the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) and the United Nations Mission in South Sudan are symptomatic of serious and repeated abuses against civilians and peacekeeping forces.

According the report of the Secretary-General on Mali (S/2016/819), the number of attacks on the Malian Defence and Security Forces and MINUSMA increased significantly in the period under review. The Malian Defence and Security Forces were attacked 39 times, MINUSMA was attacked 27 times and a company that works for MINUSMA was attacked once; whereas during the previous period, there were 9 attacks on the Malian Defence and Security Forces and 15 on MINUSMA. A total of 34 peacekeepers were killed and 190 were injured between January 2015 and November 2016 in Mali and, on 13 August 2016 alone, 50 civilians were killed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Just the day before yesterday, attacks against a MINUSMA convoy north of the town of Douentza led to the deaths of two peacekeepers and the injury of seven, three of whom are in serious condition. These attacks and the modus operandi of these terrorist groups underscore the insecurity in which United Nations troops operate. Carrying out a peacekeeping and peacebuilding mission in such circumstances has become a perilous exercise, as evidenced by the heavy price paid by peacekeepers in MINUSMA, which has become one of the most dangerous and deadly operations ever.

The gravity of the situation is such that it affects the very effectiveness and efficiency of peacekeeping operations and undermines their credibility. In that regard, we have several options before us. We could maintain the status quo and ignore the threats and their devastating consequences. We could refuse to get involved when terrorist movements are present and thereby give up on our main objective of maintaining peace and security. Our final option is to try to adapt peacekeeping operations so that they can better respond to the threats posed by the emergence of asymmetrical threats and terrorism.

It is the firmly held belief of the Government of the Republic of Senegal that the current and future success of peacekeeping operations in fulfilling their mandates will depend largely on their ability to adapt to the changing environments in which they are deployed. Any other course of action would divert us further from our primary goal of maintaining international peace and security. We should not satisfy ourselves with simply taking note of the fact that United Nations peacekeeping missions are not in a position to carry out counter-terrorist military operations, as noted quite rightly in the report of the High-level Independent

Panel on Peace Operations. In addition, we must also think of other ways and means to equip our missions with the necessary capacity to effectively respond to the threats, which are today an indisputable fact of life.

My country, Senegal, which is the seventh-largest troop contributor in the world, the third-largest in Africa and the largest in West Africa, believes that in the context of adapting peacekeeping missions to the new and asymmetrical circumstances, there are two major areas of action on which we must focus our attention and mobilize our efforts. It is first and foremost a matter of equipping peackeeping operations with the capacities necessary to carrying out their mandate both safely and effectively. This requires an objective review of the reality and daily lives of staff deployed in these theatres areas of operations.

In this respect, it would be advisable to review and readjust operational concepts for peacekeeping operations, tailored to the contexts within which they operate in order to endow them with more robust mandates. In that respect, resolution 2295 (2016), on the mandate of MINUSMA, is a welcome step forward towards the consideration of this need.

However, in order to have a better impact on the ground, we must strengthen our missions in terms of equipment and operational capacity, making greater use of modern technology. In fact, better access to detection technology, programmes to mitigate threats linked to improvised explosive devices, intelligence-gathering and resilience improvement through the development of improved mobility and medical support capacities could allow peacekeeping operations to function more safely and effectively.

In any case, the experiences of MINUSMA, the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and MINUSCA, which now rely on military capacities and modern technologies, have demonstrated that the responsible use of these tools has a multiplier effect on effectiveness. In this connection, we pay tribute to the ongoing efforts of the Secretary-General to reinforce that component of peacekeeping operations. We welcome the discussions under way for the development of a political framework for intelligence-gathering in the aforementioned peacekeeping operations.

The second major axis of action relates to innovative interinstitutional collaboration in the fight against asymmetric threats. Relevant organizations involved in the fight against terrorism must therefore support peacekeeping operations by sharing their expertise and experience in terms of prevention and in the fight against terrorism and violent extremism. In order to optimize the contribution of these institutions, it would undoubtedly be beneficial to ensure that they are closely engaged in the planning stage of missions. The strengthening of such interinstitutional cooperation must therefore involve a wider-scale synergy and coordination among the competent entities of the United Nations, including through dialogue and the exchange of information, especially during the conception and planning stages of missions.

It would also be beneficial to develop a strengthened cooperation among peacekeeping operations and counter-terrorism institutions, troop- and police-contributing countries and host States in developing an innovative collaborative strategy that could serve to mitigate the vulnerability of our missions to asymmetric threats. It is clear that, through collaboration and the sharing of efforts, experiences and expertise, we will be able to better understand these threats and thereby develop coherent, holistic and global strategies and approaches in order to provide an effective response.

As I conclude my statement, I stress that the strengthening of the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations not only requires but demands an unwavering and constant political commensurate with the impact of asymmetric threats. That is the full scope of this open debate, convened by Senegal, as a sign of our commitment to peace and security in Africa and throughout the world.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I give the floor to other members of the Council, starting with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine.

Mr. Klimkin (Ukraine): Before I address the subject at hand, I wish to extend my deepest condolences to the families and loved ones of the victims of yesterday's terrorist attack in Mali, as well as to the Governments and the peoples of Mali, Togo and France. This heinous act makes today's meetings even more pressing, so I shall start by thanking you, Sir, for convening this important debate and by commending Senegal for its outstanding contribution to United Nations peacekeeping endeavours, both in the field as one of

the major troop- and police-contributing countries and here in the Council as the current Chair of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations.

Ukraine aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the observer of the European Union. In my national capacity, I would like to add the following comments.

Ukraine attaches great importance to United Nations peacekeeping, and considers it to be one of the core tasks of the Organization and an important tool for ensuring peace and long-term stability. Ukraine is one of the leading European troop-contributors to United Nations peacekeeping operations and is proud to be a part of this important endeavour of the Organization. Despite the ongoing aggression launched by Russia against Ukraine, we will continue our active participation in United Nations peacekeeping activity.

United Nations peacekeeping operations have proven to be a highly adaptive instrument and have contributed much to the resolution of conflicts. This year, the Council and the General Assembly have already considered various aspects of United Nations activities in upholding and sustaining peace. We welcome several important decisions adopted within the United Nations regarding peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities.

Simultaneous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture (see S/2015/490) have become a significant step forward in the implementation of a conflict-prevention approach. The conclusions and ambitious recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations have provided a new perspective to the nature and challenges of PKOs. The conferences in London and Paris on the implementation of the 2015 Peacekeeping Summit outcome were a logical continuation of this process. We see our deliberations today as yet another step towards taking forward the United Nations peacekeeping review process outcome.

As is rightly pointed out in the concept paper (S/2016/927, annex) before us, today United Nations missions face enormous and often asymmetrical challenges, including direct attacks by terrorist groups. We commend the efforts of the Secretariat and contributing States in enhancing the preparedness of United Nations peacekeeping operations to face these threats. However, a lot more has to be done. In this regard, I would like to highlight the following points.

First, as an active troop- and police-contributing country, Ukraine attaches great importance to the issue of adequate force generation, which remains a challenge for United Nations peace operations. Ukraine strongly intends to extend the geography of its Blue Helmets' participation in United Nations missions. Following the 2015 high-level Summit, Ukraine has submitted its respective pledge to the United Nations Peacekeeping Capability Readiness System.

Secondly, we support the need for a better integration of modern technology and intelligence capabilities into peace operations. We call on peacekeeping operation host countries to give due consideration to this certainly positive practical step aimed at enhancing the efficiency of peacekeeping activities.

At the same time, all the United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding review outcomes that I have mentioned focus on a people-centred approach. Therefore, thirdly, the protection of civilians is often decisive for the success and legitimacy of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

My country is committed to the policy under which the protection of civilians is an overarching goal of United Nations peacekeeping. In May, Ukraine joined the Kigali Principles on the Protection of Civilians, a guideline based on a premise that peacekeepers must protect civilians from the threat of physical violence, including terrorist threats.

It is also important that troop-contributing countries be provided with comprehensive, sufficient and timely information on the security situation on the ground. That is crucial if peacekeeping operation personnel are to be well prepared, including for making prompt decisions on the use of force in cases of imminent terrorist threats or threats to the civilian population. As a matter of principle, every uniformed peacekeeper who witnesses violence against a civilian should not hesitate to do everything possible to stop it.

In the same context, let note the importance of drawing the right lessons from the violence in Juba in July and the way the Mission in South Sudan responded to it — especially helpful for preventing similar situations from occurring in the future, wherever United Nations peacekeepers are deployed, and for

maintaining the credibility of, and confidence towards, the United Nations among the local population.

Fourthly, at the current stage, United Nations peacekeeping operations are not suited for carrying out full-fledged counterterrorist measures. Indeed, counter-terrorist activities are a direct responsibility of each and every Government. Asymmetrical terrorist tactics not only threaten the population and peacekeeping personnel directly, but also target the critical infrastructure of host countries. In that regard, States suffering from terrorist activities should be provided with the necessary advice and expertise to develop or improve their relevant capabilities and strategies. Peacekeeping operations should play their part in that process.

Another important aspect is the mandates given to peacekeeping operations. We believe that missions should be provided with clear, coherent, achievable and, at the same time, resilient mandates, sufficient to ensure security and public order, including stopping the illegal inflow of weapons and mercenaries. Given that the security situation on the ground could change swiftly and dramatically, such mandates must include provisions that enable peacekeeping operations to use force when there is a direct threat to its personnel or civilians, including terrorist threats. In that regard, the role of the Security Council is indispensable. Clear mandates is a primary precondition for the efficiency of peace operations.

Peace missions also need means and resources for the effective monitoring and verification of ceasefires, the withdrawal of heavy weapons and full disarmament under the United Nations disarmament, demobilization and reintegration standards. Sustainable de-escalation and implementation of other elements of peaceful settlement and peacebuilding, including holding elections, are not possible without a robust international security presence that can ensure and monitor the implementation of all security-related provisions until legitimate law-enforcement institutions are established.

We believe that, when drafting missions' mandates, we should avoid sticking to the already outdated approach that deems most modern conflicts internal in nature. The objective reality is that most of them are, if not of inter-State, then definitely of cross-border or hybrid nature. Those changes in the nature of conflicts necessitate a review of the ability of the United Nations to respond promptly and efficiently to new challenges and circumstances.

Ukraine has learned lessons from its own experience of asymmetrical threats — the terrorist component of the hybrid war waged against Ukraine is evident. According to reports of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the situation in Ukraine, civilians have paid the greatest price for this conflict. Since 2014, OHCHR recorded 9,640 people killed — including up to 2,000 civilians — and 22,431 injured. The situation in Ukraine effectively proves that terrorism can be used as an element of hybrid war against sovereign States.

Last but not least, we believe that the United Nations should build and enhance its strategic partnership with regional organizations and work alongside with them, while sharing its unique experience in peacekeeping activities. In that regard, we see the potential for establishing closer United Nations ties with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) that will contribute to the OSCE peace activities on the ground, especially when missions of that regional organization are deployed in an insecure environment. Ukraine also welcomes the initiative to appoint a United Nations Secretariat liaison on peace and security in Vienna, which could contribute to greater cooperation between the United Nations and the OSCE on enhancing the latter's ability to enforce and keep peace whenever such a need arises.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate Ukraine's unwavering commitment to the flagship activity of the United Nations for the years to come.

Ms. Power (United States of America): I want to thank Minister Ndiaye and Senegal for highlighting the risks posed by extremists and militia to civilians and to peacekeepers. I think one can tell by the packed Chamber that this conversation is overdue, and we really thank him for leading and putting the issue on the map. Although the Council today will not hear the voices of peacekeepers and civilians who are vulnerable to asymmetric threats, surely, if they were here, they would thank him as well.

I would also like to thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson, Secretary-General Jean of the International Organization of la Francophonie, Under-Secretary-General Fedotov, Assistant Secretary-General Laborde and Mr. Boutellis for their very informative briefings.

This is not an academic debate. Just yesterday, as others have noted, a mine reportedly killed a Togolese peacekeeper in and two civilians in Mali. The United States condemns that attack and we extend our deepest condolences to the victims and to the Governments of Mali and Togo. Right now, peacekeepers in places like Mali, the Central African Republic, South Sudan and the Golan operate under the daily threat of asymmetric warfare. The United States recognizes those peacekeepers for deploying to some of the world's least secure States. Their service is vital to international peace and security, and when the goals of their missions — supporting political processes, strengthening State institutions, protecting civilians — run counter to the goals of non-State armed groups, peacekeeping operations are vulnerable.

I want to make the case today that peacekeeping missions must be better prepared to operate where groups target civilians and peacekeepers. That means being prepared to use robust force to carry out their mandates, which includes protecting civilians when authorized by the Security Council to do so. That requires not just better equipment and training for peacekeepers but more systemic reform in how we on the Council and the United Nations manage peacekeeping operations.

First of all, I would like to comment on the role of peacekeepers themselves. Some Member States today will say that United Nations peacekeepers simply should not be asked to protect civilians from terrorists or militia. They argue that regional organizations or other coalitions should shoulder that responsibility. I want to say that those who make that argument have a point. Far too often, United Nations peacekeeping operations do not have the equipment, the training, the logistics, the intelligence or the leadership needed to protect themselves, never mind civilians, against groups prepared to bomb and kill civilians as part of their fight. But the solution cannot be only to tell the United Nations to hunker down and wait for someone else to take care of the problem, because the fact is that United Nations peacekeepers are sometimes the only forces present to help civilians in need.

The Security Council deployed peacekeeping missions with mandates to protect civilians in places like Mali and the Central African Republican because countless people needed urgent help, notwithstanding the important initiative that regional forces had shown in both of those countries, which themselves took on great risks and faced very difficult circumstances operating under various flags.

The Council judged that the United Nations was best placed to organize and deploy a sustained multinational force with enough capabilities to make a difference. For now, the reality is that the Council will continue to deploy United Nations peacekeeping missions to fragile and insecure environments to protect civilians. And, as extremist groups increasingly take advantage of these weak States to find safe havens, peacekeepers will need to be ready to respond, or their attackers will feel a growing sense of impunity. To clarify, we, the United States, do not believe that United Nations peacekeepers can or should become offensive counter-terrorism forces. We know that that is unrealistic. But the United Nations cannot walk away because there is a terrorist threat where peacekeepers are deployed. As an international community, we do not have that option.

United Nations peacekeeping missions should be fully prepared to protect civilians when terrorists arrive in a town and start shooting civilians. They should be prepared to protect themselves when the United Nations knows that terrorists are preparing to launch attacks against its own personnel. This is not a radical idea. The United Nations own guidance already explicitly provides for it. We in the Council annually renew mandates for forces that we know are present where terrorists are present.

The United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) shows how peacekeeping missions have to adapt. When it was authorized and deployed, in 2013, MINUSMA was intended to stabilize the peace in Mali after extremist groups had seized approximately half of the country's territory. Yet the peace process has faltered. There has not been full implementation, and terrorist groups like Ansar Dine have continued to act as spoilers and attack civilians and United Nations troops. In many parts of Mali, the country's people are now looking to MINUSMA to protect them rather than Government forces. MINUSMA's troop-contributing countries are taking enormous risks to support the vital Mission and they have our eternal gratitude. Mali is the deadliest peacekeeping operation in the world, with 65 peacekeepers killed by hostile action just since 1 January and 139 peacekeepers killed since 2013.

MINUSMA shows the way in which we are all falling short in meeting the complex challenge.

The Mission has dire gaps in its capabilities, which undermine its ability to respond to terrorist attacks. Many contingents do not bring suitably armoured vehicles to protect against improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and conduct mobile patrols. We Member States must urgently and durably address the pending shortage of helicopters, which could mean significant delays in medical and casualty evacuations. Outmoded logistics mean that the Mission struggles to deliver food, water and ammunition across long supply lines to remote bases. While we greatly appreciate that troop-contributors have improved MINUSMA's intelligence capabilities, troops at many of the force's bases still do not have the equipment to know which groups are preparing to attack the Mission, or from where. I know that the Council members who visited Mali heard this first-hand from the forces.

This brings me to my second point. The Secretariat, troop- and police contributing countries and Governments like mine that train and equip peacekeepers need to work together to prepare missions to repel attacks on the United Nations and civilians. Addressing such gaps starts with deploying troops that are better equipped and trained to operate in unstable environments in the first place. That is why the United States Government is providing counter-IED training, contributing logistics capabilities, like airlift to peace operations, and partnering with the United Nations to provide better technology for troops to communicate and use geographical data to improve decision-making. In that regard, new technologies can be helpful. For example, unmanned aerial systems could allow peacekeepers to detect threats earlier and monitor critical supply lines while keeping troops out of the firing line. The United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has used such unmanned systems to help the Government track armed groups and plan operations that help protect civilians from imminent attack.

We know that, here at the United Nations, some continue to be sceptical and worry that this technology will be too intrusive. Peacekeeping missions, however, share the information that they gather with host countries — it is important to stress. We also must note that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations is addressing concerns about the storage and security of the information collected, which has also generated concern. Even as we address these concerns together through more consultation and transparency, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the benefits of unmanned aerial systems are lifesaving for both civilians and peacekeepers. We as members of the Council should encourage the United Nations, troop-contributing countries and host Governments to deploy these systems. Our peacekeepers, we know, are often in impossibly difficult circumstances. The least that we can do here back in New York is reduce their sense of blindness. Over the past 15 months, starting with the first-ever leaders' summit on United Nations peacekeeping, Member States have also pledged more than 55,000 new troops and police officers, including new medical, aviation and engineering capabilities. These collective efforts to improve peacekeeping have generated a new reserve on which the United Nations can draw to replace units unprepared to execute mandated tasks. Accordingly, when the United Nations observes a pattern of underperformance or an egregious failure to act by peacekeepers, the Secretary-General should repatriate and replace the contingent.

Looking beyond equipment and training, the proliferation of asymmetric threats against peacekeeping operations will also require an evolution in peacekeeping leadership. In the field, Force Commanders should be able to expect that every contingent in a mission will be ready and willing to respond when a terrorist unexpectedly strikes or when the opportunity to head off an imminent attack presents itself. Instead of relying on military responses to asymmetric threats, missions should, as others have noted, consider expanding their relationships with local populations. For example, peacekeeping missions could broaden outreach to faith leaders, local officials and other members of civil society, while helping address suspicions about the United Nations role and giving peacekeepers better insight into threats on the ground. Peacekeeping missions should of course be able to draw upon the counter-terrorism resources within the United Nations system. We appreciate that Assistant Secretary-General Laborde of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) could join us here. We hope that CTED can work with other United Nations agencies to deploy experts in preventing violent extremisms and assist Force Commanders and Special Representatives of the Secretary-General.

In conclusion, on 12 October, militias from the Séléka coalition reportedly attacked civilians near the town of Kaga-Bandoro in the Central African Republic.

One witness, a 40-year-old woman named Marcelline, recalled,

"[w]e were in the house when suddenly the Séléka arrived and set it on fire. They killed my uncle and stabbed my brother to death".

Another 48-year-old-resident, named Yongon, told a journalist that he ran past a body with its head cut off, as he searched for cover. Looking to escape the violence, people like Marcelline and Yongon fled towards the safest place that they could find, a base of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic. In that case the peacekeepers responded, firing on the Séléka until the United Nations had repelled the militia. This is of course just one case. In far too many others, United Nations troops did not answer similar calls for help.

The incident in Kaga-Bandoro shows that when violence comes, people still desperately look desperately to the United Nations to help keep them safe. More important, it shows that when peacekeepers act, they save lives. We must not let asymmetrical threats keep peacekeepers from taking such action to protect the vulnerable.

Mr. Ybáñez (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to begin by thanking you, Mr. Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, President of the Security Council for this month, for having organized this open debate to allow the Council to address the complex subject of the maintenance of international peace in asymmetrical situations. I also thank all the briefers — Ms. Jean, Mr. Fedotov, Mr. Laborde and Mr. Boutellis — for their constructive ideas and suggestions.

I would also like to reiterate Spain's strong condemnation of the terrorist attack yesterday on a unit of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), close to the town of Douentza, and also the attack on 4 November in northern Mali. We would like to express our sincere condolences to the families of the victims and to the Governments of Mali, Togo and France, and to the United Nations.

Spain fully aligns itself with the statement to be delivered later by the delegation of the European Union. We wish to make the following comments in our national capacity.

Peacekeeping operations are a crucial tool in achieving international peace and security, and they prove their worth every day. In recent years, we have seen important changes in the global security situation that have compelled us all to adapt. Peacekeeping operations have also been affected by those changes. We commend the progress made in implementing the recommendations for the reform of peacekeeping operations. However, the increasing complexity of their functions and of the security contexts in which new missions are deployed requires that we deepen our collective thinking about whether they are prepared to act effectively in the new contexts.

We agree with the observation of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (see S/2015/446) that peacekeeping operations are not a suitable instrument for carrying out military counter-terrorist operations. At the same time, many peacekeeping operations are now deployed in operative settings where, in addition to the complexity of the political processes, there are considerable asymmetric threats and terrorism. Those are specific problems that cannot be ignored. We are all responsible for resolving them with a view to ensuring the protection of the contingents and making it possible for them to carry out their mandate effectively. To that end, we must begin by giving those operations the necessary specific capacities.

Recent experience has shown us that the intelligence and mobility capacities adapted to such contexts play a vital role, as do the means and technologies used to protect the contingents. They provide greater knowledge and enable us to anticipate threats and maximize the impact of their work. In that regard, we note the fundamental role that the All Sources Information Fusion Unit has played in the proper functioning of MINUSMA. Similarly, specific training is vital. Spain has offered, in a timely manner and on request, training in protection against improvised explosive devices. The armies of numerous countries, such as Lebanon, Afghanistan, Colombia and Peru, have benefited.

A clear and precise mandate and rules of engagement are also necessary. We support the efforts being made by the Secretariat to modernize, streamline and adapt the procedures for bidding and force generation. It is a bottleneck that needs to be addressed immediately. The existing procedures are designed for a static model of peacekeeping operation and are applied with difficulty in highly volatile situations. That is why we commend the new initiatives of the Secretariat. Similarly, we

need to make progress in decentralized management, delegating more authority to the heads of missions and giving them greater autonomy.

As we have previously said, the protection of civilians is an essential and complex task. Its success is fundamental for the credibility of the operations themselves and of the international community. We must focus on effective implementation of the mandates for the protection of civilians on the ground, which is made particularly difficult in the new security contexts. The use of force for self-defence and in defence of the mandate may require a robust mandate in those contexts in order to truly protect civilians. That could occasionally include a proactive, rather than a reactive, approach when countering serious and imminent threats. The autonomy of the Security Council to include the necessary measures in the mandates that apply in asymmetric contexts, in exceptional cases and always in line with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of peacekeeping operations, must be respected. Training of contingents in the work of protecting civilians is also vital, and it is an area that we must continue to stress. We must also improve the assessment mechanisms suited to such tasks.

All this requires a substantive and fluid dialogue with the troop-contributing countries. Fostering such dialogue was one of our campaign commitments when we joined the Security Council in January 2015, and it has been one of the priorities we have unquestionably worked for throughout our term.

Developing local capacities to combat terrorist threats, prevent radicalization or demobilize fighters is a key element. The United Nations police could contribute to supporting capacity-building for the police forces of the host country with a view to them operating more effectively and with increased security in contexts where asymmetric threats are present, and also to developing investigation capacities, such as forensics.

In addressing asymmetric threats, we cannot limit ourselves to focusing only on security. It is imperative that we have a comprehensive focus that goes beyond peacekeeping operations but should not be alien to them. Political solutions are a central axis of peacekeeping operations. Similarly, peacekeeping operations can exercise their mediation and conflict prevention capacities, contributing to combating radicalization and violent extremism that can lead to terrorism.

To that end, we must insist on the need to maximize the capacities of mission personnel to interact with local communities and stakeholders. I believe that the police forces under military dicipline, as is the case with the Spanish Guardia Civil, have a very useful role to play in that regard. The recent deployment of the Guardia Civil in the framework of the European missions in the Central African Republic has been a very positive and rewarding experience, and it benefited from that neighbourhood policing capacity to get closer to the local population.

It must not be forgotten that the implementation of the women and peace and security agenda in this area is also crucial, given the positive role that women and women's organizations can play in combating violent extremism. Likewise, it would behove us to bolster the coordination of our work in those areas, including programmes to prevent violent extremism, which are being undertaken by the various units of the United Nations in this context. Such coordination could enhance mission planning.

In the context of the ideas I have just presented, we hope that the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism will be implemented. It envisages integrating the prevention of violent extremism into the relevant activities of peacekeeping operations, in accordance with their mandates. As I stated at the outset, we agree that the peacekeeping operations are not a suitable tool for the military operations against terrorists, but it is clear — and I believe the debate is proof of it — that they have an important role to play in ending the scourge of terrorism. In such joint efforts, I can assure the Council that the international community will always have the active cooperation and the firm commitment of Spain.

Mr. Aboulatta (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to express my gratitude to the Senegalese presidency for holding such an important debate on the role of peacekeeping operations in confronting asymmetric threats. The changing security environment and the changing nature of conflicts in which United Nations missions are deployed compel us to continuously review the peacekeeping operations. Such review would enable the missions to keep up with the security requirements imposed on the international community.

The mandates of United Nations missions have evolved from monitoring peace agreements between

international parties to dealing with internal conflicts. The parties to such conflicts are made up of armed groups that resort to asymmetric attacks against civilians and peacekeeping operations and forces. We must therefore review the ability of peacekeeping operations to carry out their mandates in the light of such dangers, and we must also review their existing capabilities that would enable them to confront those asymmetric dangers, whose nature and cause we must seek to understand.

There are some similarities in the methods that are used by the various armed groups, terrorists and extremist organizations, such as the use of improvised explosive devices. However, the desired objectives of those groups often differ. In most cases, armed groups are parties to a conflict of a political nature; their aggressive attacks target uniformed forces, whether those of the State or those of the United Nations. On the other hand, operations carried out by terrorist groups or organizations are considered criminal and motivated by ideology, and they mainly target civilians. It is therefore necessary, in addressing such attacks, to use a strategic and comprehensive approach that includes countering extremist and terrorist ideologies. With that in mind, I would like to make the following specific points on peace operations facing asymmetric threats.

First, peacekeeping operations are not charged with executing counter-terrorism operations. Their role in that regard is limited to enhancing the capacity of States to regain security control, which they do by supporting reform processes targeted at security and judicial institutions. They assist in building the necessary framework needed to promote the rule of law so as to counter the extremism that leads to terrorism. In addition, they implement disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, pursuant to the mandate entrusted to the particular mission.

Secondly, we must enhance the security procedures of peacekeeping operations and ensure that they are equipped and prepared to protect personnel against any danger that might arise. We should also ensure that United Nations missions have adequate medical capacities, most importantly the ability to conduct medical evacuations. Such preparations must be taken into consideration during the initial stages of establishing a mandate. We must reinforce training and security measures in order to address such dangers, as well as prepare and organize refresher training, including simulations, at the headquarters of United Nations missions.

Thirdly, confronting armed groups and attacks and enhancing safety and security measures is not a pretext for the use of force in an active or aggressive manner, nor is it a justification for the use of certain controversial methods that do not enjoy consensus among Member States in peacekeeping operations, such as the use of intelligence methods or modern technology to gather information.

Fourthly, it is important to promote coordination between the various United Nations agencies and departments, especially between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Political Affairs, as well as between peacekeeping operations and United Nations offices around the world, while also respecting the mandates entrusted to each entity. Coordinated efforts must therefore rely on the comparative advantage of each agency, ensuring the effectiveness of the entire Organization. It is therefore imperative to design peacekeeping mandates with a view to contributing to settling the conflict politically and not just managing it in the absence of a long-term political horizon.

The added value of peacekeeping operations does not lie in military action or managing the risks of conflicts. Instead, it lies in establishing a strategic and comprehensive approach to addressing the crisis — an approach that ensures sustained peace. The only way to ensure that United Nations forces are not targeted or exposed to asymmetric attacks is to uphold the neutrality of the United Nations and its peacekeeping operations, while communicating with the parties concerned so as to create common ground that can lead to a peaceful settlement of disputes.

Mr. Bessho (Japan): I would like to express my sincere appreciation to you, Sir, for convening an open debate on the timely topic of peace operations facing asymmetric threats. I would also like to thank the briefers for their insightful briefings.

United Nations peacekeeping operations are a key pillar in the maintenance of international peace and security. As a member of the troop-contributors committee, Japan contributes personnel, as do many other Member States. The expectations for United Nations peacekeeping are high, and its roles and responsibilities have expanded and diversified over the

years. In that context, asymmetric threats have become one of its major challenges.

Asymmetric threats in the form of physical attacks against peacekeepers make the implementation of peacekeeping mandates far more difficult for a number of peacekeeping missions. One such mission is the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), where troops have been a target of attacks by terrorist groups. Japan co-sponsored resolution 2295 (2016), which requested MINUSMA to move to a more proactive and robust posture in carrying out its mandate. Furthermore, the resolution prioritized the protection of civilians and the stabilization of areas where civilians are at risk, including against asymmetric threats. That includes improved intelligence capacities, training and equipment to counter explosive devices, secured logistical supply routes and improved medical evacuation procedures. The resolution also clarifies the Mission's mandate with a view to ensuring the security of personnel. Japan strongly hopes that those measures will bring tangible results in improving the Mission's security and its capacity to implement its mandate on the ground.

Japan concurs with the view expressed in the Secretary-General's report that United Nations peace operations are not an appropriate tool for military counter-terrorism operations (see S/2015/446). The question, then, is how can we best enable missions to implement their mandates in complex environments where asymmetric threats exist? Certainly, the Security Council should give a sufficiently robust mandate to peacekeeping missions enabling them to ensure the security of their personnel. Beyond that, however, how robust a mission's mandate should be for the protection of civilians against asymmetric threats will have to be studied on a case-by-case basis. It should take into account the capacity of national security forces and the presence and capacity of other international forces complementing the national security forces, in parallel to the United Nations mandated mission.

In the light of asymmetric threats, enhancing the capacity of peacekeepers becomes more important than ever. Insufficient capacity not only undermines the ability to implement peacekeeping missions' mandates, but can also expose them to great risks. Communications is an area where capacity could be improved. We are currently supporting the United Nations Signals Academy in Uganda in order to provide peacekeepers with communications training that will enable them to better gather and share essential information, which is necessary for their own security and the effective implementation of their mandates.

Even more important is the capacity-building of the countries suffering from internal conflicts. As Foreign Minister Fumio Kishida pointed out in the July open debate (see S/PV.7750), the training of domestic police forces is necessary to eradicate violence and terror. In complex environments with asymmetrical threats, peace is not achieved solely through peacekeeping operations or their military components. In that understanding, Japan has provided training for more than 20,000 police officers of the Democratic Republic of the Congo over the past 12 years, in collaboration with the police forces of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Japan, together with the international community, will continue to support institution-building in such sectors as security, the judiciary and border control.

Furthermore, improved exchange of information among the relevant institutions, including counter-terrorism institutions, could lead to reduced risks for peacekeepers. We believe that efforts, when combined, could contribute significantly to the containment of asymmetrical attacks. The efforts I have described fit into Japan's policy of seeking to contribute more proactively to international peace, in line with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Japan will continue to be a strong partner of United Nations peacekeeping operations through our personnel on the ground and our support for capacity-building.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all field personnel serving in United Nations peace operations and offer my deepest condolences to the families of those who have made the ultimate sacrifices in their lines of duty.

Mr. Ibrahim (Malaysia): On behalf of the Malaysian delegation, I join earlier speakers in thanking you, Sir, and the Senegalese presidency for convening this open debate. The significant number of high-level participants is a testament to its importance. I also take this opportunity to acknowledge the commendable role that Senegal has played and continues to play as a major troop- and police-contributing country to United Nations peace operations.

I thank the Deputy Secretary-General and all the briefers for their valuable contributions and insights.

Former Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld famously said, "The United Nations was not created to take mankind into paradise, but rather, to save humanity from hell". Since that time, the concept of United Nations peacekeeping, which he pioneered, has evolved into one of the most important instruments available to the United Nations to support diplomatic efforts in maintaining international peace and security. It is clear that the need for United Nations peacekeeping remains immensely pressing. In 1990, the total United Nations peacekeeping deployment stood at roughly 70,000 personnel. Today, that figure stands at slightly more than 116,000 personnel deployed in 16 active missions, 9 of which are in Africa and out of which 5 are in francophone countries.

A key turning point in the evolution of traditional United Nations peacekeeping mandates was the inclusion of civilian protection elements as the core mission mandate, first introduced by resolution 1270 (1999), concerning the situation in Sierra Leone. As rightly noted, an increasing number of peacekeeping mission, which have the protection of civilians as a core mission mandate, are currently deployed in complex geopolitical environments, including those that pose significant asymmetric threats. The recent surge and persistence of asymmetric threats against United Nations peacekeepers complicate already precarious security situations and threaten to unravel hard-won gains and progress in the restoration of peace and stability in concerned countries.

In the face of increasing asymmetric threats, one approach could be to address such threats with similarly asymmetrical thinking, focusing on such key areas as networking, methods and ideologies. Another area of priority should be to ensure that troops on the ground are afforded the necessary and appropriate equipment and training. On the other hand, new technologies that could contribute to better intelligence and situational awareness are critical. More opportunities for troop-contributing countries to partner with relevant donor countries or institutions to equip troops with new, specialized skills — for example, to detect and disarm improvised explosive devices — are equally urgent.

Malaysia continues to believe that a holistic approach is the best solution to containing asymmetric threats. To that end, we reaffirm our support for and endorsement of the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations and the priorities outlined in the Secretary-General's implementation report (S/2015/682). To further contribute to this debate, Malaysia wishes to make the following recommendations.

First, the host nation is encouraged to establish a networking mechanism to allow information-sharing with peacekeepers. This will assist in planning for operations as well as in identifying possible threats prior to the United Nations peacekeeping deployment.

Secondly, the host nation forces should be ready to work hand in hand with United Nations peacekeeping operations in addressing the threats. The host nations force must be prepared from the beginning of the deployment of peacekeeping operations to assume full security responsibility for the missions.

Thirdly, the war on asymmetric threats will take generations to resolve. The host nation should therefore place greater emphasis on human resource development, particularly focusing on young people and women. These groups must be given the opportunity to participate actively in any peace process and peacebuilding efforts in order to make the process sustainable.

Fourthly, peacekeeping missions must be adaptable and responsive to the various lessons learned in past experiences in order to continue to improve themselves in responding to new threats, including asymmetric ones.

As a firm believer in multilateral approaches to the maintenance of international peace and security, Malaysia has been an active contributor to United Nations peacekeeping. Since the 1960s, just three years after achieving independence, Malaysia has to date participated in more than 30 peacekeeping operations. In that regard, I wish to reaffirm Malaysia's continuing commitment and support.

In conclusion, let me pay tribute to the tireless and dedicated efforts of the Blue Helmets serving around the world. We salute them for their bravery, selfless service and sacrifices.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Thailand on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

Mr. Martins (Angola): Allow me to first congratulate Senegal on assuming the presidency of the

Council and to commend the Senegalese delegation for organizing this very timely debate on asymmetric threats faced by United Nations peacekeeping or peacebuilding operations — an issue of crucial importance to the performance and future of peacekeeping missions. I welcome and thank you, Minister Mankeur Ndiaye, for presiding over this important debate, and the briefers for their very insightful remarks.

We acknowledge with great concern the increased targeting of peacekeeping missions amid asymmetric conflicts involving Government forces and non-State armed groups, in particular extremists and terrorist organizations, and tactics used by them, often in the form of hostage-taking, suicide bombings and the use of improvised explosives devices, which are fuelled by radical extremism, intolerance, hatred or sheer lack of respect for fundamental human rights. This leads to an extremely complex and unsafe environment for United Nations peacekeeping missions to effectively and successfully implement their mandates in the protection of civilians and the mission's integrity, the promotion of peace solutions and political processes.

The High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations made clear reference to the inability of United Nations peacekeeping missions to engage in military counter-terrorism operations due to their inadequacy in responding to this type of assignment. However, peace missions and operations, which are usually working in hostile environments, are required to deliver results, which is why there is the need to urgently review their capacity to operate safely and effectively while adjusting their postures to changing needs. This implies adopting policies dealing with political challenges arising from complex environments and preventive efforts to deal with perceived threats.

First and foremost, the preventive efforts to be adopted by peacekeeping operations should target violent extremism. Peacekeeping and special political missions must find political solutions to violent extremism, be able to talk to all actors and try to identify the more moderate voices among them on which to rely in order to eventually move political processes forward.

In his Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, the Secretary-General recommends to Member States that they integrate preventing violent extremism into relevant activities of United Nations peacekeeping operations and special political missions in accordance with their mandates, which calls for troop-contributing countries to train their personnel to deal with these issues. Despite the principal fact that confrontation is outside the scope of peace operations, military tools must not be discarded. Indeed, they must be used if necessary to counter violent extremism, particularly in missions with protection-of-civilian mandates.

Another crucial aspect of prevention touches upon the provision of assistance to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes and security and defence sector reform in case the peace missions have to develop exit strategies. Such strategies are possible only when consistent programmes empowering national armed defence and security forces are effectively in place and ready to deliver. In fact, we consider it crucial to make redoubled efforts and assign adequate resources to defence and security sector reform, which must be the object of major attention in peacekeeping mandates. The countries receiving peacekeeping missions must gradually adjust their own armed forces' and security forces' capacity to enable them to address the threat of terrorists and extremists and permit peace missions to formulate exit strategies.

By 2015, the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations had already concluded that the deteriorating security environment in which peace operations are deployed, characterized by high-intensity conflict, and the use of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) — the terrorist weapon of choice — could discourage Member States from contributing to peace operations due to the growing risks and threats of the use of such devices. In the deadly events that we have recently seen in Mali and in Somalia, such devices have become a major hindrance to the implementation of peacekeeping mandates and a major safety issue in the protection of civilians. Angola supports the establishment of a comprehensive counter-IED asymmetrical-threat approach as a strategy framework to respond to this deadly threat as such an approach might help prevent vehicle-borne IED suicide attacks against United Nations personnel and civilians.

Although United Nations peace missions are not suited to engage in counter-terrorism, the United Nations cannot turn its back when faced with asymmetric threats. It is entitled to respond in order to fulfil its core mandates of protecting civilians and facilitating political processes. Some areas for strategic and operational improvements have been identified, such as better understanding of the context and the planning of missions, including through operations with regional organizations; clear mandates, appropriate postures,

adequate resourcing and capacity to operate in hostile environments, all of which can be achieved through better cooperation among the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop- contributing countries; special emphasis on troop-contributing forces and countries and host nations; appropriate support and predeployment training; greater and innovative cooperation among peacekeeping operations and counter-terrorism bodies; developing intelligence-gathering capacities and integrating them into mission structures as a crucial component for the safety of peacekeepers and overall success of peace operations; and, finally, establishing an effective connection and relationship with local populations as a central feature of missions' mandates.

Angola believes that such a concerted effort and holistic approach by peacekeeping missions and peacebuilding agencies, coupled with the support from host nations, civil society and the international community at large and by shifting the focus from military solutions to national political dialogue will gradually generate solutions to asymmetrical threats.

In conclusion, we insist on the absolute need to strengthen the capacities of national defence and security forces as a prerequisite for a sustained and sustainable solution to the security threats facing these nations.

Mr. Liu Jieyi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China appreciates Senegal's initiative in holding today's ministerial meeting. We welcome Foreign Minister Ndiaye as he presides over this meeting. I wish to thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson, Executive Director Fedotov, Secretary-General Jean, Executive Director Laborde and Director Boutellis for their respective briefings.

At present, the international situation is undergoing profound changes, and the environment and the tasks that United Nations peacekeeping operations are facing are getting increasingly complex. The formulation and execution of the mandates of peacekeeping operations are encountering serious challenges. The system of peacekeeping operations needs to keep up with the times and be better able to adapt to the changing situation and actual needs.

Today's open meeting is most timely. It is hoped that all parties will take full advantage of it so as to engage in an in-depth reflection on the situations, tasks and future developments facing United Nations peacekeeping operations with ideas for further improvement. China wishes to elaborate on the following points.

First, the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as well as the three principles governing peacekeeping operations, namely, the consent of the parties, impartiality and non-use of force except for self-defence and defence of mandates, are the cornerstones of peacekeeping operations to which we must commit ourselves. The purpose of deploying peacekeeping operations is to help host countries establish and maintain a sustainable environment of peace so as to create conditions for the political settlement of disputes. Adequate cooperation on the part of host country Governments is an important prerequisite in ensuring that peacekeeping operations achieve their goals. Conditions vary from one host country to another and circumstances change constantly. It is therefore essential to adequately respect the host country's sovereignty and, in keeping with changing circumstances, strengthen communication with the host country regarding the peacekeeping operation's deployment timeline and adjustment of the mandate, while fully heeding the opinion of the host country.

Once the situation changes and the host country requests the withdrawal of the peacekeeping operation, the Secretariat should establish, under the Council's political guidance, a specific withdrawal timetable and avoid an open-ended stay in the host country.

Secondly, the mandates of peacekeeping operations should be explicit and operable, with a clear focus. Mandates are the basis and guide for peacekeeping operations in conducting operations, as well as an important factor with an impact on the efficacy of an operation.

In changing circumstances, peacekeeping missions face a wide array of factors that affect their performance. When formulating or renewing the mandates of peacekeeping operations, it is essential to comprehensively take into account the priority needs and prevailing circumstances in host countries and the ability of troop-contributing countries (TCCs), while focusing on the central task of the maintenance of peace. It is essential to ensure that mandates are explicit, clear and operable, and, in keeping with dynamic demands, that they continually adjust to the priority tasks and focus of the work of the various stages.

Missions are there to assist in rebuilding the host country, and therefore adequate attention should be

afforded to the host country's ownership, while focusing on the host country's "blood-generating function and avoiding attempts to be all-encompassing, which will result only in diverting peacekeeping resources from the central goal of the maintenance of peace, thus affecting the overall effects of the peacekeeping operation.

Terrorism is a common threat faced by the international community. China understands the desire on the part of some countries that hope that peacekeeping operations play a greater role in counter-terrorism efforts. Peacekeeping missions can indeed act in accordance with Council mandates and, where necessary, help host countries strengthen capacity-building on counter-terrorism.

Thirdly, the Secretariat should proceed from the overall long-term interests of peacekeeping operations and comprehensively examine new situations and new challenges in peacekeeping operations. It should seriously summarize experiences and lessons learned and grasp crucial links with a view to systematically improving peacekeeping operations and strengthening their efficacy and capacity to deal with complex situations.

First, it is essential to improve the entire command system. The Headquarters is charged with the strategic planning and designing of the peacekeeping operations system, with a focus on situation analysis and providing policy guidance to various missions. It is necessary to avoid replacing macro-management with micro-interventions. It is essential to focus on strengthening the contingent command capability of the various missions and the coordinated action among the military, police and civilian components of missions with the aim of forming synergies. That is particularly important for the overall efficacy and performance of missions in emergency situations.

Secondly, it is also important to strengthen the security, early-warning and protection capabilities of peacekeepers. According to statistics provided by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in the year 2015 alone, a total of 129 peacekeepers paid the ultimate price. In the first eight months of this year, that number had already reached 69. The safety and security of peacekeepers must be afforded greater attention. The Secretariat and special missions should formulate detailed security and safety guidelines and, in coordination with TCCs and host countries, strengthen follow-up and assessment of local security situations, enhance pre-warning capabilities against security threats and internal information sharing and ensure that security protection, adequate equipment and resources are put in place, as well as strengthen medical rescue and evacuation capabilities in high-risk emergency environments.

Thirdly, it is important to strengthen logistical support. The peacekeeping budget for the year 2016-2017, approved by the General Assembly in June, amounted to $7.87 billion. As the user and manager of such a large amount of resources, the Secretariat must improve its management level and efficiency, optimize the logistics support mechanism and demonstrate its responsible attitude towards the entire membership by ensuring that peacekeeping resources are used optimally, while eliminating waste.

In areas such as procurement and outsourcing of services and the formulation of budgets, the related regulations and systems must be strictly abided by. It is essential that precious peacekeeping resources be used with maximum efficiency. Adequate and responsive predeployment training, as well as necessary equipment and other resources, will guarantee the implementation of peacekeeping operation mandates. It is essential to ensure that peacekeeping operations are afforded the required training and resources to ensure that they have the capabilities necessary for the implementation of their mandates. It is essential to pay attention to the actual difficulties faced by TCCs from developing countries and encourage strengthened capacity-building on the part of those countries through bilateral and multilateral cooperation.

Fourthly, it is important to recognize the role of TCCs. Peacekeeping forces represent the fundamental guarantee of United Nations peacekeeping operations. TCCs and police-contributing countries (PCCs) are the main actors in carrying out peacekeeping operations. Peacekeepers perform tasks on the front lines, despite all difficulties and dangers, to assist the United Nations in discharging its Charter-based responsibilities, while making important contributions and sacrifices.

The long-term development of United Nations peacekeeping operations also depends on the efforts of TCCs and PCCs. TCCs must be accorded the respect and recognition they deserve, or the long-term development of United Nations peacekeeping operations will be negatively affected. It is essential to strengthen communications among the Security

Council, the Secretariat and the TCCs, give full play to the role of the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations as the deliberative organ on peacekeeping policies, and amplify the voice of the TCCs in peacekeeping affairs.

China has always firmly supported and actively participated in United Nations peacekeeping operations. We have dispatched a total of more than 30,000 peacekeepers. As we speak, more than 2,600 of them are serving in 11 peacekeeping missions. China is the largest TCC among the Council's permanent members, and the second-largest financial contributor to the peacekeeping budget. China is comprehensively implementing the commitments declared by Chinese leaders to further support United Nations peacekeeping operations. We have achieved important progress in areas including the generation of standby forces, dispatching helicopter squadrons and the training of peacekeepers from various countries and helping African countries strengthen peacekeeping capacity-building. China stands ready to work with the vast United Nations membership in the concerted common effort to further improve the United Nations peacekeeping system in the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. Delattre (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to begin by warmly thanking the Senegalese presidency for convening this meeting on a very important topic for the Security Council and for the United Nations in general. I also to thank today's briefers: Mr. Jan Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations; Ms. Michaëlle Jean, Secretary-General of the International Organization of La Francophonie; Mr. Yuri Fedotov, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; Mr.Jean-Paul Laborde, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate; and Mr. Arthur Boutellis, Director of the Brian Urquhart Centre for Peace Operations.

As we have just heard, the United Nations must face up to increasingly complex and non-permissive environments as they engage in actions in the field. That has been true for some time now for many special political missions, which operate in particularly difficult circumstances in terms of security. That has been the case for over 14 years in Afghanistan, where the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan has supported the restoration of governance and has done so faced with the threat of the Taliban and other terrorist groups. And the same can be said for the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq and the African Union Mission to Somalia.

In the framework of peacekeeping operations, the prevailing need of protecting civilians is increasingly confronted by asymmetrical threats. That is particularly the case in Mali, where the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) must face such threats while it focuses on the protection of civilians and supports the peace process. The adoption of a robust posture is clearly not just desirable, but indispensable. In Security Council resolution 2295 (2016), the Council conferred the necessary mandate upon MINUSMA in order to be able to respond to the threats it faces and to protect Blue Helmets.

In that regard, I wish to pay tribute once again to the soldiers of MINUSMA and to all the soldiers of peacekeeping operations, who perform their duties in particularly difficult conditions. In particular today, I am thinking about the Togolese contingent of MINUSMA, saddened by the death of one Blue Helmet, the wounding of several of his comrades and the death of several Malian civilians who died in those attacks. I extend the condolences of France to the families of the victims and to the authorities of Togo and Mali.

MINUSMA is not alone in operating in a very complex theatre, and it can count on the full support of France. Every day, the Barkhane Force carries out counter-terrorism operations in Mali, and more widely in the Sahel to support States in the region. It does so while simultaneously providing support to MINUSMA and by working to improve security of the Blue Helmets.

The need to face such asymmetrical threats should shape our deployment of peacekeeping operations and also the way in which they function. There is a need to make efforts along those lines on several fronts.

First, with regard to planning, an in-depth analysis upstream of deployment would allow us to properly identify threats and challenges that peacekeeping operations must respond to. The establishment of the Strategic Force Generation and Capabilities Planning Cell, as proposed by the Secretary-General and to which France provides financial support, should provide us with a body that is in place to respond to the need for improved planning.

Secondly, building on that, we need to properly define the mandates and the stance to be adopted by peacekeeping operations. The Security Council must give a clear mandate to peacekeeping operations in terms of the use of force as and when that may be necessary. The goal is to foster a robust posture that will allow for a response to threats and also allow the mandate to be properly implemented while such threats are grappled with. That has been the step taken by the Council in terms of MINUSMA, but also in the case of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo where we mandated an Intervention Brigade.

Thirdly, peacekeeping operations must be equipped with appropriate resources, whether those be human resources or the necessary equipment in order to fulfil their mandate. Intelligence-gathering and analysis capacity are vital to anticipate and understand the threats on the ground. The development of autonomous intelligence-gathering capacities must contribute along those lines. We must also strengthening the security of United Nations staff on the ground, including by demining. In that regard, I wish to commend action undertaken by the United Nations Mine Action Service in many theatres.

Finally, given the urgency of certain situations, it is important to think about the introduction of reactive procedures that would equip the contingents with appropriate matériel.

Having troops who speak the local languages is also an essential factor, as underscored at the ministerial conference on peacekeeping in Francophone environments in Paris. That conference brought together several French-speaking and non-French speaking troop-contributing countries to identify necessary strategies in order to better respond to the specific threats posed in theatres operation in the French-speaking world. That was not just an issue of the language, but also force generation, the provision of equipment and crisis emergence. I would like to pay particular tribute to the efforts made by the International Organization of La Francophonie and the personal engagement of its Secretary-General to uphold the role of the Francophone community as a key actor in the international community, including in international peace and security.

Responding to all the challenges that lie before us requires deepening the triangular dialogue on cooperation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop- and police-contributing countries. The establishment of a Strategic Force Generation and Capabilities Planning Cell, a step that we support, will contribute to that cooperation.

Responding to asymmetrical threats, but also permanently reducing them, means that we have to identify the root causes and the mechanisms to identify early warning signs and to act in response in advance. That involves thinking about the way in which the United Nations system, at all levels, takes into account the threat of violent extremism. In that regard, the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism proposes useful and very relevant recommendations.

The theatres where peacekeeping operations are deployed are particularly vulnerable to the threat of violent extremism, given the political, security and, indeed, economic and social challenges that loom over them. That point that has been made repeatedly. Given the reality with which we are confronted, we need to better understand that phenomenon and craft appropriate responses in those theatres, always upholding human rights. To that end, we would like to encourage the strengthening of contacts among peacekeeping operations, United Nations agencies and th relevant United Nations bodies on combating violent extremism, especially the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate. That dimension must be taken into account in a more systematic fashion in the support given to host countries — for example, in the framework of national programmes on disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, or support to security sector reform. The exchange of good practices should be encouraged in order to help host countries to better face that scourge.

Peacekeeping operations have to deal with increasingly complex contexts and challenges. They are all the more necessary for protecting civilian populations and in maintaining international peace and security. France will continue to participate and to very actively support United Nations peacekeeping operations, and we will play our full part in the quest for greater effectiveness and greater relevance of such operations. That is in fact one of the core goals of the Organization.

Mr. Rosselli (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this debate. I also

thank the briefers for their presentations: Mr. Eliasson, Ms. Jean, Mr. Laborde, Mr. Fedotov and Mr. Boutellis.

There can be no doubt that in recent times peacekeeping operations find themselves deployed in increasingly complex theatres, in which armed groups continue to pursue their criminal objectives through the use of asymmetrical and terrorist tactics. They deliberately target civilians and also the staff of United Nations missions, and they are doing so at an ever greater rate. Against that backdrop, we pay tribute to each and everyone of those members of peacekeeping operations in the United Nations who have lost their lives as a result of the such attacks. We also acknowledge the heroic work of the many thousands of contingents who daily risk their lives to protect civilians in extremely complex and dangerous environments.

This reality is shared by several United Nations peacekeeping operations, such as the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan, the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, among others, which poses a great challenge not only to United Nations staff but also to the implementation of mandates.

As the the concept note prepared by Senegal (S/2016/927, annex) correctly mentions, the purpose of this debate is not about mandating peacekeeping operations to engage in military combat against terrorism. On the contrary, the objective of this debate is to address the subject of adapting the presence of peacekeeping operations to such scenarios, ensuring that they have the skills needed to operate safely and that they can fully undertake their mandated tasks, especially the protection of civilians.

Uruguay understands that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between two concepts: the first is protection against asymmetric or terrorist threats present in the operating environment of peacekeeping operations; the second is the fight against terrorism, including counter-terrorist offensive military operations. In that regard, I reiterate the statement made in the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations to the effect that "United Nations troops should not undertake military counterterrorism operations" (*S/2015/446, p. 12*) and that

> "[w]here a parallel force is engaged in offensive combat operations it is important for United Nations peacekeeping operations to maintain a clear division of labour and distinction of roles" (*ibid.*).

In the view of my delegation, the proactive engagement of a peacekeeping operation must not be manifested in direct actions or attacks in the fight against terrorism because that way would alter their nature and purposes. For these reasons, Uruguay does not believe it appropriate to give any peacekeeping operation a mandate to engage in military activities against terrorism or asymmetric threats.

Now, the question arises: If peacekeeping operations are not suitable to undertake military activities against terrorism or asymmetric threats, who or what should do so? First, the State affected must act through its relevant national institutions. Secondly, if the State is not able to carry forward the fight against terrorism, resort may be made to the use of an instrument supplementary to the presence of a peacekeeping operation that can combat terrorist threats or asymmetrical — that is, a multinational force equipped and trained to fight terrorism, and mandated by the United Nations, could take charge of that task. One example of the various tools available to United Nations peacekeeping operation is the case of the African Union Mission in Somalia, which is tasked, inter alia, with reducing the threat of the Al-Shabaab terrorist group and other armed opposition groups. Thirdly, and as I shall note shortly, the peacekeeping operation itself can play a role in support of development and the strengthening of the institutional capacities of the State in preventing terrorism.

It is evident that we must work to improve the operational capacities of peacekeeping forces, which would result in increased security for personnel and greater efficiency in the implementation of the mandate, particularly the task of protecting civilians. As noted in the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Uruguay believes it critical for peacekeeping operations be equipped with the capacity and training required, which requires better equipment and training oriented to the tasks to be undertaken. In addition, we must ensure appropriate operational concepts and rules of engagement, adjusted to the situation and existing threats, that allow troops to protect themselves and fulfil their mandates, exercising effective use of force adjusted to international humanitarian law.

In this sense, it is appropriate to thank and congratulate the Secretariat — in particular the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Field Support and the Integrated Training Service — for their work to improve the effectiveness of military operations and the training of forces through the development of manuals for infantry battalions and other units. My delegation would suggest that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, in collaboration with Member States, should also develop tactics and techniques for the use of United Nations peacekeeping forces against terrorists undertaking asymmetric actions.

In addition, peacekeeping operations could benefit directly from increased cooperation with United Nations agencies engaged against terrorism, including the Counter-Terrorism Committee, the Analytical Support and Sanctions Monitoring Team pursuant to resolutions 1526 (2004) and 2253 (2015) concerning ISIL (Da'esh), Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities, and other relevant organizations engaged in the fight against terrorism. Dialogue and exchanges of information can be very useful, especially during the stages of planning or reviewing a mission.

Finally, peacekeeping operations can play a support role in the development and strengthening of the institutional capacities of the State in preventing terrorism, especially through security sector and justice reform. I would cite as one example the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic, whose mandate includes such tasks, including the provision of strategic and technical advice to the authorities of the Central African Republic in the design and implementation of a security sector reform strategy; support for the authorities in the development and implementation of a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme; and support for the justice system.

Finally, I reiterate the importance that Uruguay attaches to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations as the principal body to review questions related to peacekeeping operations in all their aspects, and where Member States can discuss and move forward in all aspects addressed in this debate.

Mr. Iliichev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson and the other briefers for their valuable contributions to the discussion on this issue of vital importance to the Organization.

Peacekeeping is an essential tool in the United Nations arsenal of measures to maintain international peace and security, resolve conflicts and assist in nation-building in the early post-crisis stage. Today, however, United Nations peacekeeping operations operate amid new challenges and asymmetrical threats, including terrorist attacks on the civilian population and peacekeepers, organized crime, illegal arms and drug trafficking, and cyberattacks. Unfortunately, this is not an exhaustive list, as the situation in countries of deployment can change rapidly and each theatre of action has its own characteristics. We should always be prepared for the possibility that a conflict will present new challenges. Regarding the recent sad news from Mali, we would like to offer our sympathies to the Governments of Mali and Togo and the families of Malians and a peacekeeper from Togo who fell victim to the latest attack.

The concept note (S/2016/927, annex) prepared by the delegation of Senegal rightly notes that the asymmetric threats to United Nations peacekeeping operations have not appeared out of nowhere, but are the result of the changing nature of conflicts. More and more often, missions are working in environments where at least one of the parties to the conflict is not a State, whether we are talking about armed opposition, illegal armed groups or even terrorists. We also see cases where, in an area where a traditional confrontation exists between two sides, a third one emerges that is not under anyone's control, as has happened, for example, in the Golan Heights, which are now controlled by terrorist and illegal armed groups. Such non-State actors are not bound by any obligations, including under international law, and they do not participate — and sometimes cannot be induced to participate — in the peace process. Of course, there can be no question that they will take any responsibility for protecting civilians, and yet the people living in the territory controlled by such groups are at the epicentre of the conflict and mingled with the insurgents, who can use people and infrastructure as human shields.

As such situations grow and spread, a debate is going on in the United Nations and the professional community about what the conceptual foundation for Blue Helmet operations should be, how they should approach situations in which it is impossible to distinguish fighters from civilians, the extent to which

they can use force and so forth. After all, United Nations peacekeeping operations represent the Organization's ideals, and any mistake can have tragic consequences and undermine its credibility. One of the concepts being discussed is the so-called people-centred approach. We believe that in such risky conditions, it is vital to ensure that United Nations peacekeepers act with extreme caution. It is more important than ever that they stick to the basic principles of peacekeeping — the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self-defence or to implement the Security Council's mandate. Otherwise, in cases where robust and, especially, preventive responses to asymmetric threats are sought, peacekeepers may end up becoming directly involved in a conflict and accused of becoming a party to it themselves. Needless to say, that is not the way problems get solved. It can only worsen the risks to the civilian population and the Blue Helmets themselves and, incidentally, it can also raise questions about their responsibilities under international humanitarian law.

For example, many Member States and independent experts who worked on preparing last year's report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture (S/2015/490) have come to the conclusion that offensive and counter-terrorist operations run the risk of retaliation and heavier losses and are therefore unacceptable from the point of view of United Nations peacekeeping. We agree with that. Peacekeepers should not do the work of non-core functions meant for specially trained national or regional forces. Such activities are entirely consistent with the Charter of the United Nations when they are conducted at the invitation of the parties or in accordance with a Security Council decision. Blue Helmets should be deployed when they can provide effective assistance while remaining neutral. The conditions for that should be carefully defined. It is not acceptable to attempt to use them to plug holes in situations where no one else wants to be involved any more. And the problem cannot be solved with quantitative indicators. At best, such miscalculations can end up creating increasing demands for Blue Helmets, and at worst can result in increasing casualties in their ranks.

We firmly believe that in order to address asymmetric threats adequately, it is essential to work on improving peacekeeping processes and cooperation with host countries. That means, first, strengthening the security resources available to peacekeepers, and then their ability to fulfil their mandates effectively. That cannot be done without proper planning when a mission's mandate is being developed, including by setting realistic goals and timelines. That should be backed up by sufficient funding, equipment and professional training for peacekeepers and leadership personnel. A lot of that could be done by the troop-contributing countries.

It is crucial to check their experience in handling high-tech security tools. As we know, things do not always go very smoothly in such areas. In that context, it is essential to discuss contingents' so-called active security, that is, the collection and analysis of potential threats. While that work is unquestionably important to operational efforts on the ground, it should be done only with the consent of the host country and in full respect for its sovereignty. We should be discussing that sensitive topic not only here in the Security Council but also with the participation of countries where peacekeeping operations are deployed, troop contributors and, of course, the Secretariat, and the most suitable forum for it is the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of the General Assembly.

One vital component without which the problem of asymmetric threats cannot be solved is ensuring effective cooperation with host countries — the national stakeholders — and building constructive and mutually respectful relations with them. Governments bear the primary responsibility for ensuring the people's safety, including from terrorist attacks, establishing the political process, providing development and addressing the root causes of the conflict. The job of international assistance is to support local and regional efforts, not replace them. We should be considering the comprehensive support that countries need in order to expand their capacity to address the root causes of crises. That should include establishing a political process, institution-building, creating development programmes and training civilian personnel and security forces.

In conclusion, it is sad to see the Ukrainian delegation using any means to continue its efforts to pursue its propagandistic goals in the Security Council. Such attacks have nothing to do with the subject of today's debate and cast doubt on the Ukrainian delegation's ability to responsibly fulfil its duties as a non-permanent member of the Council.

Mr. Ramírez Carreño (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): As President of

the Non-Aligned Movement, I have the honour to speak today on its behalf. We would like to thank the delegation of Senegal, especially Mr. Mankeur Ndiaye, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, for organizing today's important debate. We are also grateful to Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson; Ms. Michaëlle Jean, Secretary-General of the International Organization of la Francophonie; Mr. Yuri Fedotov, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; Mr. Jean-Paul Laborde, Executive Director of the Executive Directorate of the Counter-Terrorism Committee; and Mr. Arthur Boutellis, Director of the Brian Urquhart Center for Peacekeeping Operations for their interventions.

The Non-Aligned Movement notes that peacekeeping has become the main activity of the United Nations and highlights the fact that non-aligned countries currently provide more than 88 per cent of the peacekeeping troops on the ground, thereby contributing significantly to the maintenance of international peace and security under the Organization's auspices. The Non-Aligned Movement is deeply concerned about the large number of deaths of peacekeeping personnel in recent years, and urges the Secretariat and other interested parties to make the safety and security of United Nations peacekeeping staff a top priority.

In view of the deteriorating security situation in many field missions, the Non-Aligned Movement stresses the need for the United Nations to adopt effective security and protection policies for peacekeeping personnel. In view of the worsening situation in many field missions, NAM also stresses the need for the United Nations to develop effective security and protection policies for peacekeeping personnel, and strongly condemns the killing and kidnapping of, and selective acts of aggression against, United Nations peacekeepers as well as all acts of violence against them.

Aware of the risks inherent in the maintenance of peace, NAM wishes to convey its deepest respect for the memory of United Nations peacekeeping personnel who lost their lives in the service of peace. Their sacrifice must be lasting testimony to the unparalleled work that they did for peace and stability.

The Non-Aligned Movement wishes to emphasize that the establishment of any peacekeeping operation or the extension of the mandate of such an operation must be done with strict respect for the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations as well as for the principles that it has elaborated to regulate such operations, which have become basic principles, mainly, the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-use of force except in cases of self-defence. These basic principles, which have guided United Nations peacekeeping operations for five decades now without any controversy, remain relevant and must be preserved. We must also preserve respect for the principles of sovereign equality, political independence, the territorial integrity of all States and non-interference in affairs that are essentially part of the internal jurisdiction of States.

NAM believes that peacekeeping operations should not be used as an alternative either to deal with the root causes of conflicts or to manage them. Conflict management must be based on and implemented through political, social and development tools in order to achieve a fluid transition to lasting peace, security and sustainable development. I must also add that exit strategies must always be agreed upon at the first stage of mission planning and must be reviewed on a periodic basis.

Although information-gathering, sometimes called intelligence, can contribute to the security and protection of peacekeeping personnel and civilians, NAM recognizes that there remain valid and legitimate concerns in this respect. The Movement praises the commitment of the Secretariat and Member States in this respect and stresses the need to reach a consensus among Member States on this very important and delicate topic in the framework of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations before continuing to develop a policy framework.

NAM reiterates its position that the General Assembly has the essential function within the United Nations system of formulating concepts, policies and budgetary questions related to peacekeeping. That is why NAM reiterates that the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations is the only United Nations forum that has the mandate of comprehensively considering the issue of United Nations peacekeeping operations in all their aspects, and that the role of the Committee continues to have great importance in the process of drawing up strategic recommendations.

Likewise, the Movement stresses the importance of the full participation of troop- and police-contributing countries in the formulation of policies and in the decision-making process so as to collaboratively

achieve the effectiveness required for the success of United Nations peacekeeping missions.

NAM also highlights the need to establish effective triangular cooperation between troop- and police-contributing countries, the Secretariat and the Security Council. NAM also firmly supports the complete reorganization of current modalities for triangular cooperation in order for this cooperation to be more results-oriented and more beneficial to all. We are prepared to undertake cooperation with the Secretariat and the Security Council to continue to develop new modes of international cooperation that would make it possible for both the parties concerned and United Nations peacekeeping operations to benefit from renewed and revitalized cooperation.

In my national capacity, I wish to express our condolences to the families of the victims of terrorist attacks that took place on 6 November in Mali, and our expressions of support and condolence to the Governments of Mali and Togo, the Blue Helmets and the French-led international force, which were the target of violent acts.

Furthermore, Venezuela wishes to stress that peacekeeping operations were not created to initiate or relaunch political processes; administer conflicts where there is no peace; or participate in military operations against terrorist groups or take on the residual tasks of anti-terrorist or other offensive operations undertaken by ad hoc coalitions or by regional or subregional forces that have withdrawn from the field.

Our delegation believes that the joint report of the African Union and the United Nations on benchmarks for the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation in Somalia of 30 June 2015 established an important precedent by determining that the security situation on the ground was not yet appropriate for the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. This parameter must be borne in mind in assessing the potential deployment of a peacekeeping operation in the field.

In this vein, we reaffirm the important responsibility of the Secretariat, in the framework of the sequential focus, to travel to the field beforehand and undertake an in-depth analysis of the context of the conflict and the priorities and intentions of the parties and other relevant stakeholders in determining whether the security and political conditions on the ground are appropriate for the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. Failing that, the mission would become involved in the conflict and a constant target of attacks.

Likewise, in undertaking their functions, peacekeeping operations must have clear mandates approved by the Security Council with regard to the protection of civilians, avoiding their involvement as a party to the conflict. In this process, we must ensure that peacekeeping operations have the necessary logistical and technical training resources to carry out its complex tasks. Under no circumstances can the United Nations use electronic media to gather intelligence signals or to detect radar or radio-electric waves emitted by the host State or its neighbours, which would compromise the confidentiality and security of the communications of such States. The same applies to any other technology or similarly invasive method, except when it has the consent of the State concerned. It goes without saying that information-gathering through covert actions, the tapping of communications and the use of informant networks is unacceptable and cannot take place been under any circumstances.

To conclude, we wish to reaffirm that sustained peace and the well-being of peoples is achieved through a political resolution to conflict and dealing with the root causes. This should be the guiding light of our efforts in the framework of the United Nations.

Mr. Rycroft (United Kingdom): I wish to thank you, Mr. Foreign Minister, for having convened this important debate.

In the light of the time, I am shortening my statement. I express my thanks to the Deputy Secretary-General and the other briefers, and I pay tribute to all United Nations peacekeepers, who do such vital work in increasingly difficult circumstances.

Since the United Nations first invented peacekeeping, the nature of conflicts has changed, and with that change has come a dramatic change to the risks that peacekeepers face. The threats that they now face now are more complex and more lethal, ranging from sophisticated spoilers who use terrorist tactics to armed groups pursuing criminal objectives. The United Kingdom agrees with the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations that United Nations peacekeeping operations are not suited to engage directly in military counter-terrorism operations. But they do operate in environments where asymmetric threats are high, so we cannot turn away from those high-threat environments. All too often, in fact, they are where the United Nations

is most needed. The issue at hand is how we operate safely and effectively in such environments — how we get better at understanding and predicting the threats and how we get better at mitigating those threats.

The High-level Panel concluded that peacekeeping missions lacked the specific equipment, intelligence, logistics, capabilities and specialized military preparation required to engage in military counter-terrorism operations. We need to ensure that peacekeeping operations have enough capability in each of those areas to operate effectively in high-threat environments and to do what they can to support broader capacity-building efforts in countering violent extremism and terrorism. The framework that we call the three "Ps" — planning, pledges and performance — which was discussed at the London peacekeeping defence ministerial meeting in September, provides a good framework for addressing those points.

Turning to the first "P", in challenging environments strengthened and coherent planning is crucial. The whole United Nations system needs to come together so that we have effective horizon-scanning and better conflict analysis. With greater use of intelligence and threat assessments and scenario-planning, peacekeeping missions will be better prepared before they deploy and will have systems in place to anticipate and react at the operational and tactical levels once peacekeepers are on the ground. Such enhanced planning also needs to take account of parallel forces, where they exist. As I have said, United Nations peacekeeping missions should not themselves be mandated to conduct counter-terrorism operations directly. But they need to be ready to work alongside others more suited to address those threats directly.

Secondly, on pledges, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations is leading work through its strategic force-generation and capabilities planning cell and the peacekeeping capability readiness system, which the United Kingdom supports, to increase the pool of troops and police who are ready to deploy. Capability gaps exist, and we need to fill them quickly. We also need to get better at matching the experience of troop-contributing countries with the areas where they are deployed. The United Kingdom has offered its engineering expertise where it is needed in South Sudan and Somalia, and our medical expertise with the forthcoming deployment of a field hospital in South Sudan.

The third "P" is performance. Peacekeepers must arrive properly trained and equipped to carry out their mandated tasks. That means training to a consistent standard and, in the context of this debate, emphasizing the force-protection aspects of working in high-threat environments. It should also be clear right from the start what is expected of peacekeepers when they deploy to an environment. As the Council, we need to get better at engaging troop- and police-contributing countries and, in turn, they need to come ready to share their experience and knowledge.

Finally, there is perhaps a fourth "P" relevant to today's debate — the one that the Deputy Secretary-General reminded us of: preventing violent extremism. No matter how well trained and equipped peacekeepers may be to cope in high-threat environments, their preparation will help deal only with the symptoms of violent extremism. Preventing violent extremism in the first place will help deal with the causes. The United Kingdom strongly supports the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, and we need to consider what more peacekeeping can do to support that agenda while integrating the work of the relevant United Nations bodies and, again, remembering the importance of capacity-building and working with host Governments to tackle extremism and terrorism through security-sector reform, judicial reform and strengthened rule of law.

Taken together, all those elements can help enable peacekeeping to rise to the challenge of dealing with asymmetrical threats.

Mr. Van Bohemen (New Zealand): Like my colleague from the United Kingdom, I am also going to shorten my statement. The full version will be available on the website of the Permanent Mission of New Zealand.

Let me begin by thanking Senegal for convening this important discussion, and our briefers for the information and analysis they have provided us today.

Others have covered the more general challenge posed to peacekeepers in the dangerous and complex environments in which many peacekeeping operations take place. I want to highlight three aspects that we consider warrant particular attention to try to ensure that peacekeepers in such environments can operate as safely and as effectively as possible.

First, it is vital that we provide peace operations with clear and realistic mandates and that those mandates be backed by appropriate concepts of operations, clear rules of engagement and adequate contingency planning. Peacekeepers must have clarity about what role they should — and should not — be playing in addressing the asymmetrical threats present in their environment. I agree with others who say that peacekeepers should not be involved in proactive counter-terrorism or counter-insurgency activities. But they will be required on occasion to take pre-emptive steps to address imminent threats and to respond in situations when United Nations personnel come under attack. We have witnessed several examples in recent years, perhaps most dramatically in the Golan Heights in 2014, of what can happen when peacekeepers do not have clear guidance on how to respond in such situations. To ensure their readiness, we also see merit in missions establishing processes to regularly test and rehearse such scenarios.

Secondly, where asymmetrical threats are present, we must ensure that peacekeepers are adequately trained and equipped, and that missions are provided with the necessary capabilities. Too often, that does not happen. We must ensure that United Nations missions are provided the necessary intelligence, logistics and force-protection capabilities to ensure the safety and security of their personnel. The use of intelligence and surveillance capabilities assumes particular importance in such environments, and are vital enablers for peacekeepers in detecting and preventing threats to both United Nations personnel and the civilians under their protection. Such capabilities save lives, and we need to move beyond the politics that currently restrict their use.

Thirdly, the Security Council needs to provide more meaningful oversight for those peacekeepers deployed to environments where asymmetrical threats are present. That need for more active Council monitoring and management of situations of risk or high or emerging risk led New Zealand to support the establishment of regular situation-awareness briefings. It is our hope that, by ensuring that Council members are briefed on emerging threats to peacekeepers and the civilians they are mandated to protect, those risks can be more effectively managed.

The work of the Council and the peace operations it mandates does not exist in a vacuum. In that regard, it is important that the Security Council coordinate its work with other United Nations and international entities active in counter-terrorism efforts, to ensure complementarity of effort and avoid duplication. Strengthened cooperation among the relevant agencies to improve the ability of peace operations to function more effectively is essential.

We also support the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, which emphasizes the need for a holistic approach to address the root causes of violent extremism effectively. In that regard, we support the Secretary-General's intention to integrate the prevention of violent extremism into the relevant activities of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

As the nature of peacekeeping evolves, the Council needs to adapt to new realities. Peacekeepers are increasingly caught between armed actors and the civilians they are required to protect. It is important that the Council continue to adapt to new forms of conflict, to ensure its peacekeepers carry out their roles safely and effectively.

The President (*spoke in French*): The representative of Ukraine has asked for the floor to make a further statement.

Mr. Vitrenko (Ukraine): Out of respect for the presidency, other delegations around the table and the broader membership, I will be very brief and will not engage in a debate with the delegation of an aggressor State.

Let me just quickly react to one point usually used by the Russian delegation, that is, that issues raised by Ukraine are not relevant to this or that particular agenda item in a Security Council debate. Asymmetrical or hybrid threats are exactly what the Russian Federation presents to the world today, not only to Ukraine. The agenda item we are discussing today is "Maintenance of international peace and security". As my Minister pointed out in his statement, already more than 10,000 people have been killed in Ukraine, and more than 20,000 persons have been wounded, as a direct result of the Russian aggression against my country. If that is not a threat to international peace and security, then what is?

Finally, let each and every State Member of the United Nations decide who deserves to serve on the Council and who does not. Should an aggressor State sit on the Council, or should the victim of the aggression? We think that the States Members of the United Nations

have already provided us with that answer when they elected Ukraine last year by an overwhelming majority to serve in the Council for two years, unlike the Russian Federation, which became a member of the Security Council in 1991 in an unclear and opaque procedure.

The President (*spoke in French*): The representative of the Russian Federation has asked for the floor to make a further statement.

Mr. Iliichev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): With regard to today's topic, I would like to draw attention to the fact that many delegations have referred today to the need for a political track in settling conflicts to prevent asymmetrical threats. In that regard, I would like to refer to the Minsk agreements, which, for almost two years now, have remained unfulfilled despite the promises of President Poroshenko of Ukraine. Shelling continues on an almost daily and various artillery systems firing on populated areas. Houses and buildings are being destroyed. People are dying. The truth is reflected in the reports of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Those reports reveal the arbitrary detentions, kidnappings, torture, sexual violence and other brazen human rights violations carried out by Ukraine, both by its security services and by other law enforcement agencies.

Changing the situation in Donbas is within the realm of the possible, and achieving solid, sound peace is a goal for which we should strive, and it is possible. However, all of that will happen only through scrupulous compliance with the Minsk agreements. It is for that reason that we call upon Kyiv to accelerate the fulfilment of those agreements.

The President (*spoke in French*): May I remind speakers to kindly limit their statements to no more than four minutes in order to enable the Council to conduct its work in a timely fashion. Delegations with lengthy statements are asked to circulate written texts and to deliver an abridged version when speaking in the Council Chamber. Speakers are also asked to deliver their statements at a reasonable pace so as to ensure accurate interpretation. Given the high number of speakers, our debate will continue through the lunch hour.

I now call on Mr. Raymond Tshibanda N'Tungamulongo, Minister for Foreign Affairs, International Cooperation and Francophonie of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Mr. Tshibanda N'Tungamulongo (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*spoke in French*): I have heard your call for brevity, Sir, but request your indulgence, given that this is a statement from the country that hosts the largest peacekeeping mission in the world.

First and foremost, I would like to commend you, Mr. President, for convening today's meeting of the Security Council on the important and relevant topic of "Peace operations — facing asymmetrical threats", and to thank you for inviting my country, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to participate. I also thank Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson; the Secretary-General of the International Organization of La Francophonie, Ms. Michaëlle Jean; and the Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate, Mr. Jean-Paul Laborde, for being here today and for their excellent briefings.

The maintenance of international peace and security is not only central to the mission of the United Nations, it is also the prerequisite for its success in development efforts and the advancement of humankind. Regrettably, the United Nations finds itself working to maintain peace and security in a world where security threats are constantly changing and increasingly complex. The environment that prevailed in 1945, the year of the Organization's founding, and the implementation of peacekeeping operations have undergone fundamental changes. Over time, the challenges that it must face have increased in number and become ever-more diverse. The conflict situations that the Organization is called upon to manage today are very different from the ones that it faced at the end of the Second World War.

At that time, conflicts were mainly inter-State conflicts, which gave rise to ceasefire agreements that peacekeeping missions were called upon to enforce. Today's conflicts are characterized by asymmetrical and unconventional threats that involve non-State actors, illicit trafficking in drugs and weapons, war crimes and crimes against humanity, and are often expressed in the form of terrorism, violent extremism and cross-border crime, which do not hesitate to use civilians as human shields, making the environment and working conditions for peace operations increasingly difficult. The adversaries that peace operations face today are lawless men, women and organizations that carry out merciless acts, with no fear of dying. Their actions pose a genuine threat to the safety and security of United Nations staff, as we have witnessed in Mali and in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo,

where the asymmetrical war being waged by the Allied Democratic Forces-National Army for the Liberation of Uganda has led to losses among the military and armed forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

In such conditions, the three main principles for the deployment of peacekeeping operations — namely, the consent of the conflicting parties, impartiality and the non-use of force — are increasingly difficult to maintain. Such principles remain relevant to conflicts between States, which are subjects of international law and equal in sovereignty, but are, when dealing with asymmetric threats, at the very least, anachronistic or outdated, as if one expected criminals to act in good faith and be willing to agree to their own neutralization or elimination. What is worse is that such conflicts make any serious efforts by peacekeeping operations to restore or maintain peace unlikely and ineffective. Peacekeepers are often compelled to justify their inability to protect civilians or be proactive in defending missions, which is simply an admission of our own lack of political will or of our inability to implement the reforms necessary to remain relevant.

Given the ever-greater number of casualties among peacekeepers and the civilians to be protected, we must take urgent and bold steps to uphold the traditional philosophy of peacekeeping operations. Such measures are to be developed within the United Nations and at the level of its Member States, including troop- and police-contingent contributors. The General Assembly, the Security Council and United Nations agencies have a crucial role to play in that regard. The United Nations must ensure that the peace operations deployed in conflict areas have mandates with rules of engagement and the human and material capabilities necessary to operate effectively, perform their tasks efficiently and achieve the desired results. To that end, they must be prepared to consider, if necessary — and this happens more often than in the past — peace operations and missions based on Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, with a more robust, even offensive, mandate and greater operational flexibility that, if need be, can impose peace and safeguard it under all circumstances.

The United nations must consider equipping peacekeeping missions with appropriate logistics and substantial financial resources, as well as with civilian and military personnel adapted to each mission. As is the case with all armies, military personnel must be ready to make the ultimate sacrifice, if necessary, to fulfil their mandate. Although referred to as peacekeepers, United Nations peacekeeping forces must, if necessary, behave like real soldiers and be perceived as such, rather than as police officers in military uniform, in order to ensure their credibility, which is essential. Given that their role in maintaining peace and international security is irreplaceable, the United Nations must avoid situations in which civilians are killed while peacekeeping missions responsible for protecting them have troops stationed nearby.

With respect to the civilian population, it is difficult to understand how it happens that they have been repeatedly attacked and massacred by hostile forces and that the soldiers and peacekeepers, who are there to protect them, have been unable to do so, regardless of the technical and legal reasons involved. In the case of my country, last August, just as before, the civilian population — in Béni and throughout the Democratic Republic of the Congo, specifically in Goma after the city fell into the hands of the rebels of the Mouvement du 23 mars (M-23) a few years ago — attacked the installations and facilities of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), expressing their frustration, their inability to understand and their disapproval regarding the inability of the protectors to act effectively, given the modus operandi of United Nations peacekeeping operations. A number of other peacekeeping missions throughout the world have experienced similar problems with the local civilian population.

While we wait for the nature and composition of peacekeeping missions to change in order to enable them to carry out military operations aimed at fighting terrorism and at dealing successfully with asymmetric wars, there is a need to increase the clout of those missions by establishing units capable of performing their tasks and by providing them with the new generation of force multipliers.

The experience of my country is full of lessons that can be learned. Indeed, the Intervention Brigade, created within the framework of MONUSCO pursuant to resolution 2098 (2013), has made it possible to significantly increase the deterrent capacity of the United Nations forces and to inflict a heavy defeat on the ex-M-23 forces. That has contributed to strengthening security in the eastern part of the

Democratic Republic of the Congo and has restored the credibility of MONUSCO from the point of view of the civilian population. The same applies to the authorized use by the Security Council of new technologies, such as drones or unarmed, unmanned aerial vehicles that significantly contribute to the collection of information about the adversary and often strengthen the prevention and intervention capacities of the Force.

Contrary to the provisions of the resolutions that authorized those two advances, which stipulated that the establishment of the Force Intervention Brigade, as well as the use of drones, was authorized but only on an exceptional basis and did not constitute a precedent, we should be realistic and bold enough to consider a change in the paradigm that would make those tools available whenever the situation on the ground requires them. That would be subject, of course, to the agreement of the country where the Blue Helmets are to be deployed and of the troop-contributing countries concerned.

Regardless of what improvements can be made to support peace operations, the increasing complexity and increasingly high cost of such operations underline the fact that prevention remains the best option. In that context, the Organization should, inter alia, bolster its cooperation with Governments, as well as with regional and subregional organizations, which play an important role not only in creating partnerships for conflict prevention and mediation, but also in establishing crisis responses that are fast and effective, thanks to their financially inexpensive nature. Such responses will be effective because they will be based on the knowledge of the specificities of the local environment.

The United Nations should continue its support to the efforts of Member States to establish strong institutions and strengthen democracy and the rule of law, so as to support States, not replace them. More specifically, there is a need to assist in the appropriation and internalization of a culture of peace and the universal values of tolerance and respect for others, rather than the imposition on others of an agenda that stems from New York. We need to bolster cooperation and strengthen trust with the host country.

Peacekeeping operations are often deployed at the invitation of or with the consent of the Government, so as to facilitate the necessary cooperation between the national security and defence forces and the forces of the United Nations. Such operations are charged with restoring peace, while avoiding getting in the way of national forces and avoiding having such missions be deployed ad infinitum with no hope of resolution.

The missions must go about their business in compliance with the laws and institutions of the host country; they must be seen as fundamentally transient. They must also take an approach that is firmly focused on the crisis and the restoration and consolidation of the host State in its regulatory functions and its abilities to meet the legitimate aspirations of its people. They should therefore primarily contribute to the restoration of State authority and the security of persons and property, particularly through concerted programmes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, as well as through security-sector reform.

There is a need to draw upon the private sector and to mobilize civil society as positive forces in the development of a public conscience and the search for a better life together, rather than exploit civil society for nefarious purposes or use civil society to oppose public authority, whether it is democratically legitimate or not. All three of the elements that I have outlined are important in order to maintain a constructive partnership.

There is a need to deal quickly with situations requiring international solidarity, especially in harsh humanitarian crises. That would help to alleviate the feelings of frustration and injustice or simply the reflex behaviours that emerge in the search for survival and often lead to violence. The adoption in September 2015 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (General Assembly resolution 70/1) was an important step in the efforts of the international community not to leave anyone behind and to ensure that all inhabitants of the world live happily and in peace.

It is necessary to respect international commitments to which States have subscribed in order to end all support for negative forces, break the supply chains of those forces and discourage the pillaging of natural resources, which is often at the root of today's conflicts. That is all the more important since, although inter-State wars have disappeared, some countries continue to practice them under the cover of the internal rebellions that they support. In many cases, the negative forces, whose actions we deplore, base themselves in neighbouring countries from which they buy their weapons, ammunition and other tools necessary for their operations.

In order to avoid such situations, the countries of the Great Lakes region of Africa signed the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of Congo and the Region in 2013 in Addis Ababa. We should act in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity through continued cooperation with the regions so as to promote the prevention and resolution of crises, while uncompromisingly enforcing international law.

I condemn the attacks against peacekeepers regardless of their motivation. We remain convinced that providing the soldiers of the United Nations with the necessary support and equipment will ensure that they are safe and secure and that they will have the necessary means to provide security to the civilian population, which is one of the most significant threats that we face.

The complexity of the conditions in which peacekeeping missions operate today requires enhanced partnerships between all stakeholders, including regional and subregional organizations, the entire United Nations family, financial institutions and international and regional donors and multilateral and bilateral partners, not to mention the troop-contributing and police-contributing countries. Only that level of cooperation will allow us to collectively address the challenges that we face today and those that we will face in the coming years.

To conclude, let me express the gratitude of my country for the commitment of peacekeepers, police officers and civilian staff, who perform their vital tasks, often under difficult conditions, working to implement the demanding mandates that the Security Council entrusts to them. We salute the memory of the thousands of men and women who have sacrificed their lives in the exercise of their functions to the United Nations in order to maintain international peace and security. I am convinced that the best tribute we can pay them is to learn the lessons of the past in order to improve peacekeeping operations and ensure that they are relevant and effective. That is why today's meeting is so important, and I hope it will not remain a dead letter.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Mr. Sobral Duarte (Brazil): I would like to thank Senegal for organizing this debate. I also thank the Deputy Secretary-General, Ms. Jean, Mr. Fedotov, Mr. Laborde and Mr. Boutellis for their briefings.

Peacekeeping operations should be primarily a political instrument in support of peace processes, as highlighted in the report (see S/2015/446) of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations.

Brazil fully agrees with the need and urgency to combat the scourge of terrorism. Brazil's own Constitution enshrines the repudiation of terrorism as one of the guiding principles of our foreign relations.

Experience has proved that short-sighted policies and a single-minded focus on the use of force have often made matters worse. The Sahel continues to face the consequences of an ill-fated intervention in Libya, which contributed to the increase in the illegal trafficking in weapons and to the spread of the activities of terrorist groups in the region, as the situation in Mali exemplifies. The multidimensional threats we face today will be more efficiently countered only if prevention is prioritized and underlying causes are taken into consideration.

Although peacekeeping scenarios have changed in the past decades, we should not be tempted to make flexible interpretations of the foundational principles of peacekeeping, namely, the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self-defence and in defence of the mandate. That is of particular relevance in cases of asymmetrical threats posed by terrorist networks with an increasingly global reach. Excessive militarization of the United Nations response in such cases not only increases the exposure of Blue Helmets, but it also endangers the security of the civilian component of the missions. Fulfilling a mandate to protect civilians from imminent threat, wherever it comes from, should not be confused with direct involvement in, or support to, offensive counter-terrorism operations.

We regret that the use of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and suicide attacks continue to increase the number of casualties among United Nations personnel. Asymmetrical threats also limit the interactions with locals and make it difficult for peacekeeping missions to carry out critical elements of the mandate. The United Nations must ensure that also under these conditions everything will be done for a safe and secure the implementation of the mandate, as well as the safety and security of its personnel. In that regard, it is crucial to establish a comprehensive

response to IEDs, thereby maintaining the military and civilian components fully prepared to accomplish the mission's mandate. Many casualties could have been avoided with the use of mine-resistant vehicles.

Further guidance and support is needed in the use of certain modalities, including new technology, intelligence gathering, standby and quick-reaction capabilities and force enablers. We encourage the Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, chaired by Senegal, to deepen discussions on how to better implement those innovative projects.

We must do much more to prevent conflicts and situations that place civilians at risk. We must also consistently remind parties to armed conflict of their obligations to uphold international law and to respect and protect all civilians, including humanitarian workers. It is equally important that the Council take a strong stance against the continued channelling of weapons to zones of conflict, including those affected by intense non-State activities. The Council should continue to emphasize the importance of the processes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and security sector reform.

We expect United Nations peacekeeping missions to remain a cooperative endeavour at the service of peace, political stability and sustainable development, with an emphasis on the primacy of politics and on prevention, as wisely proposed by President José Ramos-Horta and the High-level Panel he chaired. In that regard, we should strive to follow up on the High-level Panel's recommendation to preserve a clear distinction between the roles of United Nations peacekeeping operations and non-United Nations military counter-terrorism operations, rather than blur the lines between peacekeeping and counter-terrorism in ways that can worsen even further the plight of civilians on the ground.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mr. Akbaruddin (India): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate on peacekeeping operations facing asymmetrical threats. I am grateful for the very interesting briefings provided earlier today.

Threats and challenges to the United Nations peacekeeping enterprise are not new. The Congo in the 1960s, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Rwanda in the 1990s, Sierra Leone in 2000 and several others since then precede the current stresses that peacekeeping faces. What is different now is that the new normal consistently requires staying and operating in volatile environments where parties involved are not only using technological advances in adapting destructive weaponry to their benefit, but are wedded to transnational ideologies and linked to transborder networks of crime and terror. Illicit violent organizations are gaining increasing control over territory, markets and populations. Although such phenomena are not limited to peacekeeping missions alone, they impact peacekeeping in a manner like never before. All this is new.

At one level, we can focus on the technical fixes to address such situations. To address these issues, we can call for the development of doctrinal principles on the use of offensive capabilities for peacekeeping missions that operate in asymmetrical and war-fighting environments. Following this approach, we can adopt new technology, intelligence gathering, standby and quick-reaction capabilities, and force enablers and hope they will do the trick. Notwithstanding the problems associated with a blurred distinction for the United Nations when a mission operates in an asymmetrical environment in parallel with a non-United Nations force, we can, as a pragmatic way forward, work with regional and other organizations, especially in situations that require responses that go beyond the nation-centric peacekeeping model. In short, we can opt for further policy and operational guidelines on how to use versatile force to match diverse threats and levels of violence and the implementation of force protection measures as a solution.

Tackling the challenges faced by peacekeeping today, however, needs more than an up-to-date tool kit. Peacekeeping operations differ from war fighting and peace enforcement in the sense that they do not entail the use of force as a central modus operandi. Peacekeeping is not about fighting an enemy, and the evolution towards more robustness has not fundamentally changed this.

The lesson learned from the history of peacekeeping is that lasting peace is not achieved through military and technical engagements, but through political solutions. Peacekeeping is not a strategy in itself, but rather a strategic tool. It requires collaboration. Peacekeeping requires a political consensus among Security Council members, troop contributors and others on the costs, limits and dangers of operations in high-risk environments. However, what we see coming

out from the Security Council today is not consensus, but dissensus. Resolution 2304 (2016), which in August revised the mandate of the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan, is a case in point. It was adopted with little agreement within the Council itself, little groundwork with the host Government and without effective consultations with the troop- and police-contributing countries that have to implement it.

The Council needs to revisit the way mandates are designed. It cannot underestimate the complexity of bringing about peace. United Nations peacekeeping operations, in the way they are agreed upon, planned and implemented, can deliver only limited successes. The Council should therefore mandate an operation to do only what the United Nations is structurally and politically organized to do, rather than provide a multiplicity of mandates and raising expectations that cannot be fulfilled, and then absolving itself of all responsibility. This current approach is not sustainable.

Specifically, the assertive conception of the use of force should be adopted with the utmost prudence, and in any case should be ad hoc. This is so because a military option carried out by United Nations peacekeepers cannot be a long-term response to what are fundamentally political problems. It is for the Council to address these politically rather than militarily.

In essence, the solutions that we seek lie as much in a better understanding of what is out there as in a more introspective understanding of what plagues us in here. This is the philosophical dilemma that the Council, an organ set up more than 70 years ago and in a world that was very different, now faces in a fundamentally changed security landscape.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Ms. Lodhi (Pakistan): My delegation would like to thank Senegal for organizing today's open debate.

The current peacekeeping environment has become increasingly complex and challenging. United Nations peacekeepers are now deployed in areas where there is no peace to keep. Targeted and asymmetrical hostile acts against United Nations personnel are among the most imposing threats faced by several peacekeeping missions. United Nations peacekeepers are expected to play a role for which they are traditionally not mandated, much less equipped. It is then unfair to blame them when they fall short of these expectations.

When we speak about dealing with asymmetrical threats to peacekeeping operations, we must be clear that we cannot erode the basic character of United Nations peacekeeping by undertaking counter-terrorism or counter-insurgency activities. We must be guided by the wise recommendations of the report (see S/2015/446) of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations that United Nations missions should not be mandated to conduct military counter-terrorism operations, as they are not suited to do so. On the other hand, the United Nations cannot turn away from conflict areas where peace is so gravely threatened, indeed undermined, by actors that recognize no restraints on their brutal tactics against civilians and peacekeepers. Nevertheless, mandates need to clearly distinguish between peace enforcement and peacekeeping.

The evolving nature of conflicts has led to the redesigning of United Nations peackeeping mandates beyond the traditional role of truce supervision. As the bulk of peacekeeping missions are now dealing with complex internal or intra-State crises, modern peacekeeping missions are being designed to address the political, security, humanitarian and development dimensions of complex crises, and often to ensure the implementation of comprehensive peace agreements.

The changing nature of threats is challenging the traditional role of peacekeeping. The presence of rebel groups, the flow of illicit weapons, planned, deliberate attacks against peacekeepers, suicide bombings and improvised explosive devices are some of the present-day threats faced by peacekeepers. This has also served to expose gaps in technology and capabilities that need to be filled to maintain the level of excellence and confidence that United Nations peacekeepers have enjoyed for so long. In view of that, we would like to stress the following points.

First, greater clarity is required on how United Nations peacekeeping operations should function in asymmetrical threat environments.

Second, asymmetrical threats put peacekeepers in harm's way, as they are faced with situations beyond their capabilities and resources. Therefore, the effective implementation of their mandate needs adequate and matching resources.

Third, our deployment decisions have to be based on consultation, preparation and knowledge of the situation on the ground. Triangular cooperation is critical for all three. As principal stakeholders, troop-

contributing countries must be fully consulted in a timely manner and have their suggestions taken on board.

Fourth, the Security Council needs to be more circumspect when mandating enforcement tasks. Peacekeepers should neither become a party to the conflict nor be perceived by the local population and authorities to be a tool of external intervention. Increased militarization of some United Nations stabilization missions could make them riskier — more dangerous, instead of safer.

Fifth, the use of modern technology consistent with the principles of peacekeeping should enhance situational awareness and help ensure the protection of civilians and the safety of peacekeepers.

Sixth, where mandated, our peacekeepers have fulfilled, and will continue to fulfil, their responsibilities to protect civilians. Clearly defined mandates would make this task much easier.

Seventh, peacekeeping works best when there is peace to keep and a political process to sustain it — hence the need for political processes to always accompany peacekeeping missions.

Last but not least, the basic principles of peacekeeping remain essential for the success of Untied Nations peacekeeping. These principles are vital and indispensable for retaining the broad support, legitimacy and credibility that United Nations peacekeeping has come to enjoy over the years.

Finally, let me say that, as a leading troop- and police-contributing country, Pakistan has contributed over 150,000 personnel and served in 41 mission in 23 countries since 1960. Our peacekeepers have worked in diverse and difficult conflict and post-conflict situations and have served with professionalism and distinction. One hundred and forty-four Pakistani peacekeepers have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Blue Helmets are a source of pride, not just for us and for the United Nations but for other troop-contributing countries as well. Those caught in the throes of conflict see themselves as guarantors of peace and the harbingers of stability. Their hands must be strengthened and their successors appreciated.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Khoshroo (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to you, Mr. President, and to the Senegalese presidency for convening this open debate. I also thank the briefers for their inputs.

My delegation associates itself with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

My delegation, while emphasizing the importance of the role of the United Nations in peacekeeping operations, believes that peacekeeping operations should not be used as an alternative to addressing the root causes of conflict.

The establishment of any peacekeeping operation or the extension of a mandate for existing operations should strictly abide by the puropose and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. I refer to principles such as the consent of the parties, the non-use of force except in self-defence, impartiality and respect for the principles of sovereign equality, political independence and territorial integrity.

I would also like to underline the unique and indispensable role of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) as the only intergovernmental forum mandated by the General Assembly to comprehensively review the whole question of United Nations peacekeeping operations. According to principles and guidelines in the annual report of the C-34 agreed upon by the General Assembly, all issues relating to peacekeeping operations, including the subject of today's debate, should be taken to the C-34 for deliberation.

In our efforts to overcome the problems emanating from the complexity and asymmetrical nature of the threats, the use of technology and intelligence cannot be ignored. However, it is necessary that the concerns of Member States, especially the host countries, be fully taken into account. Furthermore, the legal aspects of using modern technology and intelligence-gathering should also be defined in appropriate intergovernmental processes.

The protection of civilians is the primary responsibility of the host countries, and, where they are so mandated, peacekeeping operations should aim to support the national efforts of host countries to protect their civilians. Therefore, any military intervention by

the United Nations or other foreign forces under the pretext of protecting civilians is not acceptable.

Regional organizations are important partners in maintaining regional peace and security. The United Nations can benefit from their cooperation in efforts to surmount asymmetrical threats and the challenges that peacekeeping missions face, when necessary, as complementary means. However, the primary responsibility rests with the United Nations. The role of regional organizations in that regard should be in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations.

United Nations police can play an important role in establishing order or re-establishing domestic police services in order to create appropriate conditions for sustainable peace and development. They should support host State counterparts in their efforts to develop community-orientated policing and mentors and train host-State police officers or provide specialized personnel for various types of investigations. United Nations police capacity must be strengthened so as to provide such useful services.

In conclusion, while paying tribute to the men and women who serve under the flag of the United Nations, especially those peacekeepers who lost their lives in the cause of peace, I would like to express my Government's readiness to contribute to United Nations peacekeeping operations logistically and militarily, by deploying troops and police to United Nations peacekeeping missions.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Skinner-Klée (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): Guatemala thanks the delegation of Senegal, as President of the Security Council this month, for organizing this open debate, and we welcome the country's Minister for Foreign Affairs, His Excellency Mr. Mankeur Ndiaye. We are grateful for the briefings by the Deputy Secretary-General and the other briefers this morning, which were extremely informative.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Guatemala thanks the President for the concept note (S/2016/927, annex) that he has circulated on peace operations facing asymmetrical threats. We share the views expressed in the concept note that most crises today can be classified as internal conflicts or intra-State conflicts, where there are confrontations between Government forces and non-State armed groups. As a consequence, security in implementing operations on the ground has become a lot more complicated. My delegation is concerned by and greatly regrets that 34 Blue Helmets were killed and another 190 injured between January 2015 and October 2016. Improving the protection and security of personnel in peacekeeping operations should continue to be a fundamental priority. In that respect, we welcome the fact that measures are being taken to improve security analysis on proposed initiatives by making timely decisions on activities that need to be undertaken and on how to manage the risks that personnel face on the ground. That information needs to be shared with troop-contributing countries in a timely fashion. The safety of personnel is a non-negotiable requirement that calls for more attention.

The reviews conducted in 2015 regarding the work of the Organization in the areas of peace and security, specifically the recommendations on peace operations in the report (see S/2015/446) of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations and on peacebuilding in the Rosenthal report (see S/2015/490), and on women and peace and security, have underscored the need for the United Nations to adapt to new situations and circumstances that have a bearing on conflicts by investing more in prevention than in containment.

Our delegation aligns itself with the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, given that such operations, in terms of their structure and characteristics, have not been created to participate in active military counter-terrorism operations, both because of their lack of capacity in the field of logistics and other areas, and above all because it distorts the doctrine that underlies peace operations. We are willing to consider emerging circumstances, but not to change the very meaning of peacekeeping operations without a broad and informed consensus.

However, we acknowledge the relevance of the views expressed by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, Mr. Hervé Ladsous; we cannot deny that extremist groups are an emerging phenomenon. That means that it is necessary to develop creative approaches to address such armed groups without compromising the foundational doctrine of the Organization's work.

In his Action Plan to Prevent Violent Extremism, the Secretary-General made it clear that the phenomenon affects the purposes and principles of the United Nations. It undermines peace and international security, human rights and sustainable development. There is no country in my region that is immune to those effects. The reality on the ground is also alarming. Of the 11 countries that are most affected by global terrorism, seven of them have peace missions with mandates from the Organization. Regarding the current situation, the international community has witnessed an increasing number of confrontations between armed political groups and militia groups, where crime, terrorism and violent extremism prevail. In some cases, the Governments of host countries to peace missions have encountered numerous challenges in seeking to protect their population.

Peacekeeping missions are not designed to, or principally aimed at, combating terrorism. Guatemala maintains its doubts as to the achievements and the implications that so-called peacemaking operations have. We believe that those types of operations distort the basic function that they pursue, bearing in mind that peacekeeping operations are not designed or equipped to impose political solutions through the continuous use of force.

It is important that the international community acknowledge that conflict prevention is a shared responsibility. It must be coordinated among all stakeholders, namely, the States involved, international and regional organizations, the specialized agencies and, of course, civil society organizations, for the purpose of working to solve the original causes of the conflict and refine the essential elements of peacekeeping operations.

In conclusion, I would like to mention something else that is no less important. Waiting for conflict situations to be included on the agenda of the Council is tantamount to adopting a reactive approach rather than a preventive one. We need to invest in prevention so that we do not have to wait for conflicts to break out in order to adopt the necessary measures. General Assembly resolution 70/262 and Council resolution 2282 (2016) were adopted in April and sent out a clear message: we must break the silos in the Organization, which is a fundamental requirement if we are to abide by the three pillars of the Charter of the United Nations, namely, development, human rights, and peace and security.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to representative of Italy.

Mr. Cardi (Italy) (*spoke in French*): First of all, I wish to thank you, Sir, for having organized today's debate. I also thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his briefing, as well as Mr. Yury Fedotov, Mr. Jean-Paul Laborde and the other briefers for their briefings on the theme of asymmetrical threats to peacekeeping operations.

(*spoke in English*)

Italy aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the observer of the European Union and fully supports the statement to be delivered by the representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in the light of our cooperation related to the upcoming split mandate in the Security Council. In the Security Council from 2017 to 2018, Italy and the Netherlands will continue their sustained efforts to promote more effective peacekeeping operations, and we encourage other countries to join us in those efforts.

In presenting my condolences for the victims of yesterday's attacks against the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), allow me to pay tribute to all those who lost their lives serving under the United Nations flag in peace operations. Fifty of them were Italians.

As the first Blue-Helmet contributor among Western countries, and the eighth overall contributor to the regular budget and the peacekeeping budget, Italy considers its peacekeeping partnership with the United Nations to be a strategic one. Thanks also to the experience gained in the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, Italy believes that it has powerful tools at its disposal to pursue the goal of adapting our peacekeeping operations to new and evolving threats. The recommendations in the report (see S/2015/446) of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations and the work carried out in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations can guide us as well.

First, I believe that a truly integrated approach is necessary, both at the United Nations and on the ground, in order to ensure that our complex efforts are holistic yet focused, thereby strengthening the whole spectrum of United Nations activities in a country. In that respect, we appreciate the establishment of a unit to handle police planning in the Secretariat. While partnerships within the United Nations system and with

contributing countries are critical, we believe that the most crucial partnerships are with local authorities and communities, which must be fully supported.

Secondly, predeployment training is crucial and provides the main means for ensuring the thorough and holistic implementation of mission mandates, thereby promoting the effective protection of civilians and ensuring the highest moral and operational standards. Through programmes offered by the Italian Centre of Excellence for Stability Police Units, Italian Carabinieri units have to date trained approximately 10,000 units from nearly 100 countries and 16 international and regional organizations, using both the English and the French languages.

Thirdly, more must be done to support regional organizations, especially in Africa, through training and assistance, including by pursuing synergies between the United Nations and the European Union. Our common capacity-building efforts must expand beyond traditional peacekeeping goals and be enhanced so as to be able to provide for essential skills in sectors such as disarmament, demobilization, reintegration, techniques to counter violent extremism, national reconciliation and the reform of the security sector. One valid example of that approach is Italy's contribution to the European Gendarmerie Force's role in MINUSMA's Security and Organized Crime Support Unit. That is a very important effort, given that the Mission in Mali epitomizes the complexity of the asymmetrical threats that peacekeeping operations must face and their consequent response.

Fourthly, as asymmetrical tactics often seek to deny cultural identities, Italy is on the front line in ensuring the protection of cultural heritage in crisis situations. We believe that that is a crucial component of our peacekeeping commitment, not only with the necessary goal of protecting human rights but also as a substantial contribution to conflict-prevention and reconciliation efforts, and preserving the rights and the identity of minorities.

Lastly, Italy strongly believes in the need for flexible mandates and adequate equipment, especially with a view to ensuring the most appropriate technological solutions to the specific evolving contexts and threats. From basic protective gear to the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, which have proved key to saving civilian lives — as was the case in the deployment of drones in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo — assets and capabilities need to be integrated in a targeted strategy.

In conclusion, I remind everyone that Italy believes that our primary focus must continue to be political solutions to crises. Avoiding conflict is the only smart and humane choice. We need to engage more in mediation and prevention, if we are to defeat the causes underlying the very emergence of asymmetrical threats. United Nations capabilities in those sectors should be strengthened, and I confirm Italy's long-standing commitment in that respect.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mrs. Chartsuwan (Thailand): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 10 States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), namely, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam and my own country, Thailand.

ASEAN wishes to congratulate Senegal on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and to express its appreciation to that country for organizing today's ministerial-level open debate on the topic of peacekeeping operations and asymmetrical threats. We thank the briefers for their respective insightful and informative presentations.

As a region that currently contributes almost 5,000 men and women to 12 United Nations peacekeeping operations, ASEAN attaches great importance to the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers. The phenomenon of asymmetrical threats is indeed not a new one. However, as rightly pointed out in the concept note (S/2016/927, annex), the recent trend in the increasing frequency and magnitude of such attacks directed against United Nations peacekeepers is most worrying. Nowhere is that more apparent than in the cases of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali and the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan, which have sustained a high number of casualties. We strongly condemn all attacks directed against United Nations personnel.

ASEAN emphasizes the role of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations as the appropriate forum for considering and deciding on key policy matters pertaining to United Nations

peacekeeping. The Special Committee has continuously underlined the importance of regular and meaningful triangular cooperation among the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop- and police-contributing countries. We consider this open debate as part of such cooperation, and we encourage the Security Council to take due note of the views expressed by Member States today. As our contribution to the debate, we wish to draw the attention of the Council to the following points.

First, ASEAN reaffirms its long-standing position that peacekeeping missions must uphold the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the basic principles of United Nations peacekeeping. Despite the changing context of peacekeeping, those principles remain indispensable for the success of all peacekeeping operations.

Secondly, there is a clear convergence of opinion that United Nations peacekeeping missions should not engage in counter-terrorism activities. At the same time, however, we cannot ignore the fact that asymmetrical threats are now part of the operational reality in which many peacekeeping missions operate. We therefore have to prepare for the worst by providing our peacekeepers with the best possible training and capabilities, including evolving technologies, so as to enhance the safety and security of peacekeepers and strengthen their ability to effectively fulfil their mandates. That requires the collective efforts of the Secretariat and the troop- and police-contributing countries. We also call upon host countries to bring to justice the perpetrators of attacks against peacekeepers.

Thirdly, military operations can address the symptoms of terrorism. However, the use of force alone will not and cannot stop the spread of terrorism. ASEAN reiterates the need for a comprehensive approach to the fight against terrorism. We therefore support an integrated and balanced implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Peacekeeping missions, where mandated to do so, can significantly contribute to pillar III of the Strategy, namely, building States' capacity to prevent and combat terrorism through programmatic support in the areas of the rule of law and security.

Looking at the broader context, asymmetrical threats are one of many manifestations of modern-day challenges facing peacekeeping operations. We hope that this open debate will constitute part of an ongoing dialogue that is critical to improving and strengthening United Nations peacekeeping through better mission planning and mandate review. On our part at the regional level, ASEAN Member States have worked on uniting our peacekeeping operations and capabilities, including through the ASEAN Peacekeeping Centres Network, which serves as a platform for information-sharing, capacity-building and exchanging views on new challenges. We therefore remain steadfast in our commitment to working closely with the United Nations and its partners towards this end.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Vale de Almeida (European Union): I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the 28 European Union Member States and on behalf of the European Union (EU) itself. The following countries align themselves with my statement: the candidate countries the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania; the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina; as well as Ukraine.

I would like to thank the Senegalese presidency for organizing the debate. I thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his briefing, as well as all the other briefers for their insightful contributions to today's discussion on the challenges posed by asymmetrical threats to the peace efforts deployed around the world.

Let me reiterate from the very start that the States members of the European Union remain committed to peacekeeping — a flagship activity of the United Nations. We highly value the partnership between the Secretariat, troop-contributing and host countries and financial contributors that makes United Nations peacekeeping unique. Welcoming also the increased attention given to the role of regional organizations in peacekeeping, the European Union will continue to look for ways to enhance our support to United Nations peacekeeping.

Recognizing the dangerous and complex context in which peacekeepers and other United Nations personnel carry out their work, we pay tribute to those who have lost their lives in the service of the United Nations. The EU is leading efforts to agree on a resolution concerning the safety and security of humanitarian personnel and the protection of United Nations personnel, and will continue working in support of that goal.

Searching for measures to increase the safety and security of United Nations personnel on the ground remains of critical importance, and is made even more pressing by the significant number of targeted attacks against peacekeepers. In consideration of the contemporary and evolving peacekeeping landscape, peacekeeping missions should deploy with at least the same technological advantages that most Governments and enterprises around the world find indispensable to their operations.

In that context, a better integration of modern technology and intelligence capabilities into peace operations should continue to be pursued. We commend the Secretariat's efforts towards the wider use of modern technologies in peacekeeping operations. We also encourage the development of information and intelligence capacities in current and future missions. The use of such resources and technology can help to improve the situational awareness of troops in real time, thereby contributing to the implementation of mission mandates, the protection of civilians and the security of United Nations personnel on the ground.

We need to maintain an open, transparent and constructive dialogue on the deployment of particularly sensitive technologies and use strategies that allow field missions to enjoy the advantages provided by modern technologies. The European Union believes that discussions on those various topics in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping are encouraging and should continue in a collective effort to find common ground.

At the same time, technology alone cannot bring about solutions and increased effects. Instead, the coherent merger of modern technology with relevant methods at the disposal of well-prepared and trained staff will be imperative in the pursuit of enhanced operational output. Adequate training certificates, recommended by the Secretary-General, are a step in the right direction. Training, including linguistic training adapted to the area of deployment and equipping personnel, before and during deployment — whether military, police or civilian — on the basis of consolidated standards is also important to ensuring successful missions.

(*spoke in French*)

As the Senegalese presidency so rightly underscores in its concept note for this debate (S/2016/927, annex), Mali is an interesting case. The strategic objective of the European Union in Mali remains the promotion of stability by combining security, development and governance in an integrated and coordinated approach of its relevant instruments. The objective is to tackle the deep-rooted causes of insecurity, underdevelopment and local, regional and national conflicts.

Our two missions that fall within the framework of the security and common defence policy deployed on the ground — the European Union Training Mission for Somalia in Mali and the European Union Capacity Building Mission in Mali — are part and parcel of that comprehensive approach. The European Union intends to enable the Malian authorities to respond directly, through their own means, to threats on the ground and, more broadly speaking, to restore sovereignty, security and stability throughout the country. To that end, the European Union has undertaken to train the Malian armed forces, by making available training experts and strategic advisers within the police, the gendarmerie and national guard forces, as well as relevant ministries for security sector reform.

At the level of security, over half of the States members of the European Union contribute troops to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA). As a result, they also directly work within MINUSMA to better respond to asymmetrical threats. The outstanding cooperation between MINUSMA and the European Union missions clearly illustrates the joint work that is being carried out to fight against asymmetrical threats. That cooperation, which is based on the implementation of their respective mandates, transcends the operational level to cover the political process as a whole.

The comprehensive approach of the European Union also includes a development cooperation component in which we are a key partner for Mali. The European Union and its member States jointly contribute close to €1.7 billion for the period 2014 to 2017 in humanitarian aid, amounting to €40 million per year. Regarding migration, Mali is one of the priority States for EU action. In the framework of the trust fund that we have established, €91.5 million have already been approved and €40 million should be approved by the end of the month.

The Central African Republic is yet another example where the European Union works in close cooperation with the United Nations and the host country to back the efforts of the Government in countering the activities of armed groups. On 19 April, the European Council approved the establishment of

the European Union Military Training Mission in the Central African Republic (EUTM RCA), which is to contribute to security sector reform in the country and make its national forces capable of responding to such threats themselves. In extension of the military advisers mission of the EU, EUTM RCA will modernize the Central African armed forces to ensure that they are effective, inclusive and subject to democratic governance. In that regard, the States members of the EU responded to the call of the United Nations and mobilized to provide resources and troops to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic in order to allow them to fulfil their mandates.

(*spoke in English*)

In conclusion, countries where peacekeepers operate are particularly vulnerable to the spread of violent extremism that may be conducive to terrorism. The EU has welcomed the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, which, inter alia, recommended that member States integrate preventing violent extremism into relevant activities of the United Nations peacekeeping operations and special political missions, in accordance with their mandates.

We also believe that peacekeeping operations are one way that the United Nations can assist local authorities in developing and strengthening their capacities to better face that scourge. It is part of the One United Nations approach promoted by the Secretary-General, aimed at achieving coherent, coordinated and integrated tactical assistance to the Member States with a view to developing and strengthening their capacities, including in the area of preventing violent extremism. The European Union encourages further coordination and exchange between the peacekeeping operations and other United Nations entities at Headquarters and in the field.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to Mr. Koné.

Mr. Koné (*spoke in French*): On behalf of Mr. Marcel Alain de Souza, President of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Commission, who wishes he could have attended this meeting but was held up in Africa due to prior engagements that are equally important to our Community's progress, I offer our apologies for his absence. I also convey our thanks for the invitation to participate in this important debate with the theme of peacekeeping operations facing asymmetric threats. Likewise, I thank all of the briefers that spoke this morning for the clarity of their presentations.

ECOWAS takes this opportunity to warmly congratulate the Senegalese delegation on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for November, just a few weeks before the international forum in Dakar on peace and security in Africa — an event that will enable us to exchange views on commitments in the region and find some clues as to how to definitively steer our region away from potential danger. That is why ECOWAS views that meeting as part of the concrete implementation of the new vision that all stakeholders could share in their response to asymmetrical challenges and threats in peacekeeping operations. ECOWAS fully backs that vision and intends to play its rightful role, as it has always done, for peacebuilding and good governance in our area.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Schieb (Germany): Germany aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union.

On 26 October, we commemorated the deaths of 201 peacekeepers in 2015 and 2016 — 201 too many. A growing number of them were victims of asymmetrical attacks. Just yesterday, two more peacekeepers lost their lives in Mali. That is why we need to redouble our efforts to protect our peacekeepers and to ensure the proper implementation of peacekeeping mandates.

The United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), one of the missions facing the most asymmetrical attacks, is a good example of how future casualties could be reduced. We consider three elements as essential.

First of all, we need better reconnaissance and information gathering. Military reconnaissance is fundamental to detecting asymmetrical threats at an early stage and setting the course for appropriate counter-measures. To make that possible, the military equipment, training and concept of operation must be adapted to the given circumstances. That is what we are trying to achieve right now in the northeast sector of MINUSMA. Germany, in partnership with neighbouring troop-contributing countries (TCCs), made a significant contribution in northern Mali, with a reconnaissance task force in Gao. That force carries out a wide array

of activities related to information-gathering, including reconnaissance ground forces, human intelligence and civil military cooperation, as well as air reconnaissance by tactical and unmanned aerial vehicles with a range of up to 100 kilometres. In addition, Germany deployed the unmanned aerial system Heron 1 for the MINUSMA mission last Tuesday, with a range of up to 900 kilometres. Its findings will help to reduce the asymmetrical threat to all TCCs, United Nations personnel and civilians alike.

Secondly, we also need better protection. Asymmetrical threats are difficult to detect and counter. Therefore, protective measures are of key importance. Germany provides a highly professional force protection unit that covers the entirety of Camp Castor in Gao. Special counter-improvised explosive device personnel support investigations into potential perpetrators. As a first step, Germany will make a financial contribution of €2 million towards the purchase of armoured vehicles, yet much greater efforts must be made since such vehicles are indispensable to protect the lives of our peacekeepers in Mali.

Thirdly, we must ensure better medical support. When United Nations peacekeepers face an asymmetric attack in the middle of the desert, 100 miles north of Gao, nothing is more important to their safety than quick and adequate medical support. In the vast expanses of northern Mali, that cannot be done without helicopters. They are of key importance to medical evacuation and protection. They are also of key importance to the moral and operational strength of our peacekeepers on the ground. Germany is currently examining ways to provide modern medical evacuation and protection helicopters for MINUSMA in 2017.

Those three elements cannot provide an overall solution to the challenges of peacekeeping in the face of asymmetric threats. Yet they represent important tangible elements for the protection of our peacekeepers on the ground. For the near future, it is crucial that the High-level Independent Panel on United Nations Peace Operations recommendations concerning asymmetrical challenges be implemented. We owe it to the men and women in the field to offer them as much protection as possible. We can only do that together and Germany is ready to contribute.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Poland.

Mr. Winid (Poland): Poland aligns itself with the statement delivered by the observer of the European Union, but I would like to add some comments in my national capacity.

First, I thank you very much, Mr. President, for organizing today's debate on such an interesting and important subject for us all, and not only for our peacekeepers serving in the field. This is our common duty.

For more than six decades, Poland has been dedicated to United Nations efforts in maintaining peace. We are among those States that, as early as 1953, sent observers to a peacekeeping mission in the Korean peninsula. Sixty-three years later, we continue to deploy peacekeeping personnel. With a contribution of more than 70,000 peacekeepers throughout that period, Poland has acquired broad, practical experience in maintaining peace. Through our more recent national efforts in some of the most demanding conflict environments, we have also experienced first-hand confrontations with asymmetrical threats and have had to deal with that challenge. In that context, we entirely agree with those speakers who have underscored the changing nature of modern threats, often arising from extra-State factors or from totally new phenomena, such as hybrid warfare.

Expectations with regard to United Nations peacekeeping, in terms of deliverables, continue to grow. At the same time, neither United Nations peacekeeping operations nor special political missions are designed to counter asymmetric threats. Acts of violent extremism have resulted in the largest death toll among peacekeepers and local mission personnel.

I believe that we should address the growing complexity of the peacekeeping environment before situations escalate beyond our capacity to react. Twenty-first century peacekeeping has to draw upon intelligence capabilities and new technologies in order to improve the safety and security of United Nations personnel. Proper training and relevant equipment may constitute a difference between life and death. Troop-contributing countries, as well as regional organizations, should take that factor into consideration.

Nevertheless, there are no quick fixes if we want durable solutions to asymmetrical threats. We need sound mid- and long-term strategies aimed at addressing the root causes of conflicts and asymmetrical threats. On-the-field measures must be preceded with political

planning and adjustments, depending on the situation on the ground. In that connection, the United Nations has and should play an important role in activities related to sustaining peace. As the Chair of the High-level Independent Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (HIPPO), José Ramos-Horta of Timor-Leste, rightly put it:

> "The 'sustaining peace' concept frees the peacebuilding enterprise from the short-term horizons that constrain it, particularly when it is conducted as part of a peace operation, which tends to treat the building of peace as a conflict management tool with few predictable resources to ensure its sustainability beyond the lifetime of the mission."

Against that backdrop, close cooperation in the field of peace operations among the Security Council, the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Political Affairs and other relevant United Nations constituencies is a must. The United Nations has a particularly vast and unique experience with regard to assistance in security sector reforms, as well as in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes. Those are crucial with regard to breaking a vicious circle of violence. They also contribute to limiting the threats posed by violent extremism.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that much has already been done. The HIPPO report (see S/2015/446), the peacekeeping review and debates like that we are having today contribute to the recognition of the challenges faced by peacekeepers. With regard to combating asymmetrical threats, our success will be very much contingent upon the coherent and persistent implementation of existing recommendations by the United Nations and the international community. We also hope that the new Secretary-General, António Guterres, will actively approach this challenge while keeping in mind that security is the cornerstone of the peaceful world we all want to live in.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Mr. Pedersen (Norway): I am honoured to make this statement on behalf of the Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden and my own country, Norway.

We thank Senegal for initiating this important debate. Asymmetrical threats, including those posed by terrorism and organized crime, are a reality of contemporary conflicts. The perpetrators of such violence are spoilers of peace. Of the 11 countries most affected by terrorism, 7 currently host United Nations peace operations. The Nordic countries fully subscribe to the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) in its report (see S/2015/446) that United Nations missions are not suited to conduct counter-terrorism operations. However, where asymmetrical threats are present, United Nations missions must adapt to deal with those challenges. Allow me to make five brief points.

First, all missions must be provided with the necessary capabilities to fulfil their mandate and ensure the safety of United Nations personnel. The HIPPO report calls for a comprehensive quality reform in United Nations operations, including through adequate medical supplies and support. The Nordic countries are pleased that the United Nations has initiated important improvements in that spirit, but much more needs to be done.

Some innovative developments indicate that we are heading in the right direction. In the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali, the Nordic countries, together with other partners, have pioneered the use of intelligence through the All Sources Information Fusion Unit (ASIFU). ASIFU helps the Mission to better monitor potential perpetrators of asymmetrical violence, thereby strengthening its ability to prevent and respond to attacks. Based on that experience, the Nordic countries recommend that the United Nations further develop its technological and analytical tools to better understand, prevent and respond to radicalization and asymmetrical violence.

Secondly, even in challenging security environments, United Nations missions must continue to reach out to local communities. Where necessary, United Nations missions must be ready to act decisively and without hesitation to protect civilians.

Thirdly, the United Nations should deepen its partnership with regional organizations, the African Union (AU) in particular. The AU has gained rich experience from dealing with asymmetrical conflict environments, such as in Somalia. We believe that a deepened partnership and exchange of best practices

would benefit all parties, including in planning and conducting operations.

Fourthly, we must ensure that all United Nations personnel operating in complex security environments have the adequate training and equipment to carry out their tasks. We must invest in leadership at all levels. Where necessary, the United Nations should facilitate and provide assistance to capacity-building and training towards that end.

My fifth and final point is that we must address the root causes of conflict and invest more in prevention, often taking the regional perspective into account. Priority should be given to stopping illicit financial flows and the recruitment of foreign terrorist fighters, as well as to improving development policies, strengthening fragile States, involving women and offering young people education and job opportunities.

Together with all relevant stakeholders, within and outside the United Nations family, we must be willing to engage for the long haul in order to prepare the ground for genuine political solutions and to sustain peace.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium.

Mr. Pecsteen de Buytswerve (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): In order to save time, I shall deliver an abridged version of my statement, which will appear in full on our Mission website.

In the face of asymmetrical threats, it is clear that United Nations troopsdo not have the vocation to fight terrorist organizations. Nevertheless, they must be able to protect themselves. How can they do that? I would like to make four points on that subject.

First, we must focus on training. It is absolutely essential for United Nations forces to be appropriately trained before deployment. Likewise, appropriate equipment is absolutely indispensable. I note in that regard that Belgium will pursue training efforts in the framework of training-of-trainers courses.

My second remark concerns the need to recognize the importance of intelligence as a factor in ensuring the effective deployment of the Blue Helmets. In the context of a deteriorated situation, it is essential to make use of improved intelligence concerning the situation on the ground. The progress made in that area needs to be taken forward.

Thirdly, it is essential to ensure that we enjoy the support of the local population. We must therefore create a network of confidence-based relations among the population. Furthermore, it is of course important to ensure that the troops deployed have the linguistic competence to ensure the best interaction possible with the local population.

My fourth and final point touches on peacekeeping operation mandates. Clear mandates — sequenced according to priority, better aligned with the consistent efforts of the United Nations system on the ground, and the suject of consultations with the troop-contributing countries — are absolutely crucial. In that framework, it would also be interesting to consider the possibility of redesigning mandates in the light of the global or regional context of asymmetrical threats.

The three strategic reviews of peacekeeping operations in 2015 all stressed the importance of conflict prevention. That finding is even more relevant today.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Oh Joon (Republic of Korea): The Republic of Korea congratulates Senegal on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. We also appreciate Senegal's initiative in convening this ministerial open debate on peacekeeping operations facing asymmetrical threats, and thank Foreign Minister Mankeur Ndiaye for coming to New York to preside over the debate.

United Nations peacekeeping operations have contributed significantly to the resolution of conflicts and to the declining number of conflicts over two decades. The Republic of Korea has long been a troop-contributing country and financial contributor to that essential function of the United Nations. Today, however, we are concerned that the changing nature of conflict and the speed of that change may outpace the ability of United Nations peacekeeping operations to respond. The threat of terrorism, for instance, is placing significant pressure on the peacekeeping system as a whole.

The report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations observed that

> "a United Nations peace operation is not designed or equipped to impose political solutions through sustained use of force" (*S/2015/682, para. 15*).

However, the unfortunate reality is that United Nations peacekeeping operations are increasingly deployed in violent and asymmetrically threatening environments, taking on an undue share of the burden. In 2016 alone, 30 peacekeepers were killed in action as a result of malicious acts. Against such a stark background, let me offer the following thoughts.

First, given the complexity of the challenges of delivering on Council mandates in such threatening environments, we must do more to address the issue of how to improve provision of field support and use of force enablers, including helicopters, heavy weapons and hospitals. It is simply unrealistic to expect good results from field missions without providing them with adequate resources to carry out their mandate.

Among the 30 casualties in peacekeeping operations directly resulting from attacks of an asymmetrical nature this year, 25 took place within the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA). MINUSMA is one of the United Nations peacekeeping missions exposed to asymmetrical threats, ranging from sporadic attacks by terrorists to cross-boundary crimes, yet it is insufficiently equipped and supported.

It may be no coincidence that in MINUSMA, one out of every two medical clinics has critical equipment gaps, including everything from integrated trauma care to intensive care. As a part of the pledge made during the 2015 Leaders' Summit on peacekeeping, the Republic of Korea is currently working with the African Union and the Government of Mali to provide equipment for a level-2 medical facility in northern Mali. Through that medical facility, it is our hope that the Government of Mali can win the hearts and minds of the Malian people and gain an upper hand in its effort to restore order in the region.

Secondly, intelligence capabilities and the use of new technologies can improve the safety and security of peacekeepers. United Nations peacekeeping operations increasingly deploy a variety of technologies to collect, communicate and analyse data and information to support decision-making and coherent operational responses. Those are part of the efforts to counter-balance the threats from the changing operational environment.

The Republic of Korea, in partnership with the Department of Field Support and Department of Peacekeeping Operations, is hosting the Third International Partnership for Technology in Peacekeeping Symposium this week in Seoul, Korea. The Symposium will provide further insight into the challenges of the modern peacekeeping environment and offer opportunities for sharing ideas on ways to overcome those challenges.

Finally, as highlighted in the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO),

> "[p]olitics must drive the design and implementation of peace operations" (*S/2015/446, p. 10*).

Conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are all part of a continuum in which the transitions are neither lineal nor strictly sequential. The pursuit of a political settlement, by maintaining a political space for United Nations mediation, is particularly important in a non-permissive environment.

The HIPPO report recognizes that where asymmetrical threats are present within the operating environment, United Nations missions must be provided with the necessary capabilities and training. The Republic of Korea, as an ardent supporter of that and other recommendations of the HIPPO and the Secretary-General, looks forward to continued efforts to that end.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia.

Ms. Krisnamurthi (Indonesia): Indonesia congratulates Senegal on assuming the Security Council presidency for the month of November and thanks you, Sir, for convening this important open debate.

We associate ourselves with the statement made by the representative of Thailand on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

Indonesia strongly condemns all acts of violence against United Nations personnel. Our heartfelt sympathy is with the bereaved families of fallen peacekeepers and other mission personnel. We salute the courage and professionalism of all those United Nations personnel who have laid down their lives while performing their duties.

The highly tragic attacks against the personnel of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali and the United Nations

Mission in South Sudan, and the everyday dangers confronted by many other peacekeeping operations, show the painful costs in terms of flesh and blood arising from the inability of States to build peaceful societies and the exploitation of divisions by non-State actors for their perverse ends.

Indonesia underlines the need for the best possible protection for mission personnel in a manner that is well coordinated and properly supported by all stakeholders, and welcomes efforts to further enhance the discourse in the context of improving the safety and security of peacekeepers. This process has to begin with the Security Council, which should ensure that realities on the ground are clearly known to all on a continuous basis. When the mandates of peacekeeping operations are drafted or modified, the Council should consult regularly with troop- and police- contributing countries, host Governments and pertinent regional actors. Leveraging its networks and pertinent actors, the Council must also try to build communication with non-State actors involved in a conflict. Not all non-State actors may have the same motivations and end goals. This is not an easy task, but every effort must be made to make them realize the imperative of not harming civilians and United Nations personnel.

As the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations and the Secretary-General have rightly mentioned, peacekeeping operations are not meant for and should not engage in counter-terrorism activities. No stone should be left unturned in enhancing the situational awareness and response capabilities of United Nations peacekeepers with better communication, coordination, predeployment training and adequate protection equipment. The key to addressing asymmetrical threats from terrorism is in the sound implementation of the United Nations Global Counter Terrorism Strategy and prioritizing conflict prevention and political solutions, as stressed by the reviews of United Nations peacekeeping operations, peacebuilding and resolution 1325 (2000).

Violent extremism often increases in the same conditions that lead to a heightened risk of conflict. While pronouncements have often been made about giving higher priority to prevention, mediation, peacemaking and sustaining peace, as laid out concurrently in General Assembly resolution 70/262 and Security Council resolution 2282 (2016), much is expected from the United Nations in terms of clearly advancing a principles-based approach to resolving ongoing conflicts effectively and preventing emerging ones. We would therefore support further discourse aimed at expanding the scope of how peacekeeping operations can provide adequate support to national Governments and local communities to prevent terrorism and violent extremism.

Given the more complex and volatile nature of conflicts today, United Nations peacekeeping missions need to be flexible within reasonable parameters. Indonesia also fully supports the effective implementation of protection of civilian mandates, but the mandates must be explicit, with clear rules of engagement, reinforced with needed equipment and resources. Peace enforcement should be pursued only as an exception and on a case-by-case basis, with thorough consultations with all relevant stakeholders, particularly troop-contributing countries and host authorities.

I will not hesitate to repeat before the Council that it is critical that Blue Helmets not be perceived as a party to any conflict. Their neutrality and credibility are of the essence. Any divergence from that principle threatens not only their safety and security, but also the safety of population that they are mandated to protect. The three proven basic principles of United Nations peacekeeping — namely, the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-use of force, except in self-defence and defence of the mandate — must be upheld.

Since 1957, when Indonesia first contributed to United Nations peacekeeping, it has accorded high importance to it. Currently, 2,867 Indonesian peacekeepers are serving in 10 different missions. We aim to contribute up to 4,000 of our highly trained and proficient troops and police by 2019 under Indonesia's Roadmap for Vision 4000 Peacekeepers. Council members will always find Indonesia to be unwavering and vigorous in its efforts to help achieve global peace and security.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Islam (Bangladesh): We convey our appreciation to the Senegalese presidency for organizing this open debate for the invitation extended to our Foreign Minister.

Bangladesh aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

In view of the evolving nature and challenges of United Nations peacekeeping operations, Bangladesh remains seized with efforts to continuously update and strengthen its deployment and operational capabilities on the ground. The growing frequency and magnitude of threats posed by various non-State actors, including terrorist groups, have made our task daunting and complex. In recent times, our peacekeepers, contingent-owned equipment and other capabilities have come under a number of indiscriminate attacks, particularly in the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali.

In recognition of our valuable contribution to United Nations peacekeeping operations, our peacekeepers have withstood those attacks and other prevailing threats, and continue to serve with a high degree of professionalism and dedication. Against that backdrop, we wish to focus on five critical issues.

First, the proliferation of asymmetrical attacks against peacekeepers underscores the importance of linking peacekeeping operations with sound and sustainable political strategies to resolve conflicts. There is a need to maintain regular engagement and consultations between host Governments and the concerned peacekeeping or special political missions to make peace processes and agreements inclusive and broad-based. Depending on the context, there may be a need to explore avenues for dialogue with the various conflicting parties in order to encourage them to adhere to the principles and rules of engagement for the deployment and presence of peacekeeping missions.

Secondly, the Council must attach the highest priority to the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers and other personnel, including through regular and meaningful triangular consultation involving troop- and police-contributing countries and the Secretariat. In order to improve situational awareness and the threat assessment on the ground, the enhanced use of technologies needs to be considered from a pragmatic viewpoint, while addressing questions relating to national sovereignty, transparency and confidentiality. Due emphasis should be placed on the mission's interface with local communities, traditional views of human intelligence, and awareness of applicable investigation and prosecutorial mechanisms. The crucial role played by joint operations centres, joint mission analysis centres and other security-related analysis capabilities needs to be optimized through regular gap analysis and core capacity-building.

Thirdly, the protection of civilians in the face asymmetrical threats should be given due priority in line with the concerned mission mandates. In view of the growing and targeted attacks against civilian and military aviation capacities and other critical enablers, their protection and upkeep also deserve urgent consideration. The development and dissemination of specific policies, operational guidelines and training manuals to address pressing issues of concern should be pursued through regular interface with troop- and police-contributing countries.

Fourthly, it is evident that peacekeeping missions are not equipped to engage militarily in counter-terrorism operations, and must not be mandated to do so. There are good practices whereby missions have effectively contributed to enhancing the capacity of host Governments in counter-terrorism efforts, including through support for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security and correction sector reform and promoting human rights due diligence. There may be potential ways for missions to expand their support for developing appropriate policies and strategies for countering terrorism and preventing violent extremism, as well as their underlying drivers, subject to specific requests by host Governments.

Fifthly, in the context of increased volatility in security environments, we must ensure that the adequate provision of defence stores in missions, as well as increased investment in medical and casualty evacuation, gets its fair share of attention. The introduction of risk premiums for troops and police deployed in difficult environments and the call for periodic review of the death and disability compensation rates are steps in the right direction. The role of the United Nations Operations and Crisis Centre, and the ongoing work on crisis management, should be properly leveraged, including through appropriate contingency planning.

In conclusion, the increasing and deepening asymmetric threats facing United Nations peacekeeping operations require a whole-of-United-Nations response in accordance with the respective mandates and competencies of the organs and entities involved. We therefore emphasize the importance of further expanding the scope of this dialogue in relation to the relevant normative discussions across the system, including within the framework of the comprehensive approach to sustaining peace.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the observer of the African Union.

Mr. António (*spoke in French*): At the outset, on behalf of the African Union Commission, I would like to warmly congratulate you, Mr. President, on the Republic of Senegal's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. And I would like to welcome the notable presence in the Council this morning of Mr. Mankeur Ndiaye, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Senegal, in a reflection of the unwavering commitment of his country, one of the Organization's largest contributors of troops to the maintenance of peace and international security, and of its determination to make a substantial contribution to the work of the Council.

I would also like to thank those ministers who travelled to New York to be here today, as well as Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson; Ms. Michaëlle Jean, Secretary-General of the International Organization of la Francophonie; Mr. Jean-Paul Laborde, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate; and Mr. Arthur Boutellis for their briefings. Lastly, I would like to reiterate our admiration for the men and women who struggle daily, in extremely difficult conditions, in order to implement the mandate entrusted to them, and to pay heartfelt tribute to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in fulfilling their mission under the banner of the United Nations.

Today, peacekeeping is evolving in highly complex and often hostile situations. In dealing with various asymmetric threats, including the proliferation of non-State armed groups and rising terrorism and violent extremism, the conduct of peacekeeping, which has been through several transformations, is still struggling to adapt to the increasing complexity of security environments. Except for a few notable cases, peacekeeping work is still underpinned by the formal principles of impartiality, neutrality and the limited use of force. Today's debate comes at the right time for us to identify areas we should think about with the goal of adapting and modernizing this valuable tool in order to enable our Organization to tackle the emerging challenges and fulfil its mission more efficiently.

In that regard, while recognizing the validity of the statement in the 2015 report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations that "United Nations peacekeeping missions... are not suited to engage in military counter-terrorism operations" (*S/2015/446, p. 45*), we must continue our effort to arrive at the right balance between preserving important aspects of our traditional principles, on the one hand, and the growing need to use force in order to tackle armed groups that fly in the face of all fundamental rights, on the other. That effort should also take into account the principle of complementarity, as provided for in Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, and which highlights the importance of making judicious combined use both of the universality of the United Nations and the advantages that regional organizations offer.

Given their proximity to and familiarity with conflicts occurring in Africa, the African Union (AU) and its regional mechanisms have shown a renewed determination to display the necessary leadership and, together with the United Nations, to contribute to our collective security, as laid down in the Charter. The experience of the African Union — which, should it need emphasizing, has enabled the emergence of an African model for peace operations — highlights the need to rethink the cooperation model between the United Nations and the AU with a view to strengthening peacekeeping's effectiveness. Based essentially on the principle of non-indifference to human suffering, what distinguishes our model is that it deploys missions with robust mandates whose main tasks are usually protecting civilians, neutralizing armed and terrorist groups and promoting the authority of the State. The African Union believes in intervening as quickly as possible in order to save lives, contain violent conflicts and help stabilize security situations in order to create the conditions necessary for the United Nations to deploy its peacekeeping operations at a later stage.

In mandating the deployment since 2003 of more than 70,000 uniformed personnel and about 1,500 civilians in nine operations, the African Union and its regional mechanisms have shown their determination to play their part to the full and make a significant contribution to collective security efforts in Africa. In that regard, the Heads of State and Government of the African Union recently decided to take on greater responsibility for financing its peace operations and to meet the commitment made in 2015 to finance 25 per cent of the cost of African Union-led peace support operations.

Those developments reflect the importance of working to consolidate a strategic partnership between the United Nations and the African Union, based on the sharing of responsibilities and the resulting costs.

That vision is particularly legitimate given the fact that the sustainable financing of peace and security in Africa is not merely an African priority but an international strategic imperative, given the complex and interconnected nature of the threats we are seeing to peace and security. We therefore hope to be able to rely on the unanimous support of Security Council members in enshrining the principle of burden-sharing and authorizing funding from the United Nations budget amounting to 75 per cent of the costs of operations conducted by the African Union with the Council's consent. We hope to see the ongoing preparations culminate in the Council's adoption of a resolution during the Senegal presidency.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands.

Mr. Van Oosterom (Netherlands) (*spoke in French*): I thank the Senegalese presidency for organizing today's important debate.

(*spoke in English*)

The Kingdom of the Netherlands aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union and its member States. In addition, we fully support the statement delivered earlier by the representative of Italy, in the light of our cooperation related to the upcoming termthat we are splitting with Italy in the Security Council. During this split term, in 2017 and 2018, the Netherlands, together with Italy, will continue its sustained efforts for more effective peace operations. As the representative of Italy stated, we encourage other countries to join us in that endeavour.

The environment in which our peace operations have to operate has become more dangerous and more challenging. Asymmetric threats in particular abound. Yesterday's attack on the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) convoy was a case in point. We mourn the people killed, and our thoughts are with the people wounded.

I would like to address three elements that in our view are of crucial importance for peace operations when addressing these new asymmetric threats. They are: the need for a comprehensive approach; the need for better-qualified troops; and the need for better intelligence.

First, let me elaborate on the need for a comprehensive approach. During the recent visit to the Netherlands by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mali, Mr. Diop, the latter stressed that we needed to address the problem of violent extremism and terrorism in a more sustainable way. We therefore need to fully understand and fully address what really drives young, often moderately religious Malians to resort to joining terrorist groups. We need to address their hopes, their ambitions and their fears.

To do so, in our view peace operations need to be part of a more integrated approach. Peace operations must be linked to other available instruments for promoting peace, security and stability. We therefore need to connect peacekeeping with the political process and with economic development. The term we in the Netherlands use is the "3D" approach, combining the means of diplomacy, defence and development. We must create economic opportunities for young people who might be receptive to the ideas of violent extremism. We must make sure that there is a political perspective, and we must make sure to prevent and address violence and to protect civilians. Only an integrated, comprehensive approach can ensure a lasting impact.

This brings me to my second point: the United Nations needs better-trained and better-equipped peacekeeping troops and police forces in order to face asymmetric threats.

As we have seen in South Sudan, protection of civilians has become a vital element in a lot of missions. But the recent report on Juba in South Sudan proves yet again how important training and equipment are for missions in order for them to be able to implement their mandates.

In terms of equipment, let me highlight the issue of helicopters and vehicles resistant to improvised explosive devices. These are scarce assets and expensive capabilities, but they are essential to counter asymmetric threats. These are also assets that are crucial to continuing to increase the necessary interaction of Blue Helmets with the local population.

We welcome the fact that the United Nations is looking for innovative solutions. In particular, we welcome the work being done for a long-term rotation plan for helicopters in MINUSMA, in Mali. Under such a plan, countries would agree to provide helicopters for a specific period as part of a longer-term planning effort. This would make it on the one hand easier for countries to commit their troops and their assets and on

the other would make it easier for the United Nations to enter into long-term planning.

Let me turn to my final point: better intelligence.

In complex and dangerous environments such as Mali, the gathering, analysis and use of intelligence is vital, not only for the effective implementation of the mandate but also for the security of United Nations personnel. We have worked together with the United Nations in developing and introducing a substantial intelligence capacity in MINUSMA, and this capacity helps the peacekeepers in seeing, hearing and understanding what is happening around them. It helps peacekeepers to understand the threats around them and helps them to address these threats, both traditional and asymmetric, as early as possible. We can all see that the concept of intelligence within the United Nations system is evolving. We believe that it has to evolve further in view of the asymmetric threats we discussed today.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands is a partner in further developing the use of intelligence in peace operations. In short, let us work together in making our peace operations more intelligent.

In conclusion, it is clear that in the current environment the United Nations can no longer rely only on traditional methods to counter asymmetric threats. We need to innovate, to adjust and to be flexible. We need to step up to face these new challenges, before terrorist groups disrupt delicate peace processes, before more civilians become the victims of terrorists, before we lose even more peacekeepers. Let us all work together to make peace operations more effective. Let us work together to make peacekeepers better equipped and better trained, and let us work together to connect peace operations, diplomacy and sustainable development. The Kingdom of the Netherlands will remain the Security Council's partner in that ambition.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Kazakhstan.

Mr. Abdrakhmanov (Kazakhstan): I commend the presidency of Senegal for bringing to light the asymmetrical threats that United Nations peacekeepers face today, deployed as they are in very hostile situations where there is no peace to keep. We strongly condemn the deadly attack yesterday in northern Mali that claimed the lives of Malian civilians and killed one peacekeeper from Togo while injuring seven others. We convey our heartfelt condolences to the Governments of Mali and Togo in connection with this tragic loss of life.

In our assessment, seven of the current United Nations peacekeeping operations face a higher incidence of asymmetric and violent threats that have resulted in a larger number of fatalities. Today's hybrid peacekeeping operations are all the more vulnerable and therefore urgently require a systematized plan to reduce the higher risk by adapting existing approaches or creating new strategies.

The Secretary-General's report on the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (see S/2015/446) noted that United Nations peace operations are not appropriate tools for military counter-terrorism operations, and we agree that the United Nations is not equipped to carry out such operations. At the same time, it is in asymmetric threat environments that the United Nations plays a vital role in protecting civilians and facilitating preventive political processes. The test is not in delivering a decisive military response but in supporting and strengthening preventive multi-stakeholder interventions that avert instability, promote good governance and sustain peace.

The key to success is thus to address head-on the drivers of terrorism and violent extremism rather than merely manage the symptoms. Therefore, a number of areas for strategic and operational improvements should be addressed so as to navigate more safely and effectively in such hazardous environments.

To begin with, it is of key importance to improve understanding of the political and historical context in the planning of missions, before deploying troops. This is all the more necessary in the case of hybrid and multidimensional missions with numerous components that are in demand in critical situations. These efforts have to be accompanied by efforts to offer technical and programmatic support to institutions in order to build and consolidate the rule of law and reform the security sector, in addition to the most important component of preventive diplomacy. We are ready to share our valuable experience in that field.

It is essential that peace operations have clear mandates and be adequately resourced so as to ensure safety and security. To combat asymmetric threats, it is essential today to strengthen anti-improvised-explosive-device training and to stress the greater provision of anti-mine vehicles.

Missions should have the ability to adequately monitor what happens in their environments by deploying intelligence capacities. The introduction of new technologies such as unmanned aerial vehicles, used solely for surveillance purposes, situational awareness and life-saving purposes for both United Nations personnel and local populations, has shown beneficial and lasting results.

Kazakhstan is a responsible Member State and one committed to peacekeeping. It is deploying its military personnel to the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in the Western Sahara and United Nations Mission in Côte d'Ivoire. There are plans to augment its contribution in the future by deploying its contingent. My country stands ready to support the United Nations peacekeeping operations in being effective and efficient in fulfilling their tasks.

The President (*spoke in French*): I give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mr. Sandoval Mendiolea (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico thanks Senegal for convening today's important debate on a subject that presents one of the most pressing challenges for some peacekeeping operations. In recent years, we have seen how the constant changes in the challenges to peace and security compel such operations to discharge their missions in unstable environments and volatile security conditions that hinder them from fulfilling their missions, and, in particular, when they do not possess the logistical capacity and means to do so. To guarantee their efficiency, effectiveness and safety on the ground, such operations must have a clear, specific mandate from the Security Council in order to be duly equipped with clear and viable strategies to perform their tasks. To that end, Mexico believes that the United Nations should be given all of the tools it needs, such as the ability to gather further intelligence as needed, in order to be able to mitigate the challenges posed by the new international peace and security landscape.

Despite what has just been said and as we have stated in the competent General Assembly forums, we reiterate our opposition to peacekeeping operations becoming counter-terrorism tools. Given their composition and nature, such operations do have neither the specific equipment or training needed to conduct logistics or intelligence operations, nor the specialized military training for counter-terrorism operations. Any attempt to drastically modify their mandates would not only damage the core of their operations but also put their staff and the civilian population that they are tasked with protecting at risk. In that regard, we agree with the recommendations contained in the Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, which states that "[e]xtreme caution should guide the mandating of enforcement tasks to degrade, neutralize or defeat a designated enemy" (*S/2015/446, p.12*), including terrorist groups or other forms of non-State actors in the mandates of such operations.

Mexico acknowledges that asymmetrical threats, including those from terrorist groups jeopardize the effective use of the mandates of peacekeeping operations and the safety of United Nations staff. Improving the interaction between the Security Council and its relevant sanctions committees, the Secretariat and countries that contribute personnel to peacekeeping operations, is of critical importance so as to enable the Council to have clear, accurate information on the situation on the ground in the countries in which those operations are deployed. In that regard, we believe that particular attention should be paid to capacity-building in peace operations deployed in complex environments in order to assist with the preventive efforts made by the host country to address such threats, particularly in the area of lending support to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes for former combatants, the reform of the security sector and the building and strengthening of national justice and correctional facilities.

Similarly, we call for the efforts of the international community to be focused on developing integrated responses and initiatives that seek to address the structural causes of conflicts — which in many instances, foster the spread of extremist ideologies that could also lead terrorism — and, in so doing, achieve sustainable peace. Finally, Mexico takes advantage of today's meeting to reiterate the importance of effectively implementing the results of the peace operations review processes that took place during the previous sessions of the General Assembly and of the Council with a view to having countries plagued by violent, armed conflict transition to sustainable peace.

The President (*spoke in French*): I give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Hilale (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, let me congratulate you, Sir, on your country's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council

for the month of November. Since it joined the Council, your delegation has worked unceasingly to promote the topics dear to our continent, including matters relating to peacekeeping, through its chairmanship of the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations and we are grateful to you for that.

I would also like to apologize on behalf of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Morocco, Mr. Mezouar, who is unable to join us given his function as President of the twenty-second Conference of the Parties United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which he opened today.

Finally, I would like to thank you for the choice of theme of today's meeting, in which we are particularly interested as a troop-contributing country as peacekeeping operations now face the challenges of terrorism, transnational criminal networks and all genres of trafficking and smuggling. The regrettable incident that claimed the life of a Togolese Blue Helmet and injured seven, including civilians, has also been mentioned during today's debate. We extend our sympathy to the people of Mali and Togo.

United Nations peacekeeping has undergone tremendous change since its creation. From the 1950s until the end of the last century, traditional peacekeeping was limited to observing ceasefire agreements and serving as an interposition force. Furthermore, to date, military observers are not armed. Nonetheless, given the changes in the nature and scope of contemporary challenges, peacekeeping operations have had to adapt and evolve. In addition, the range of their activities has expanded and now encompasses several peacebuilding tasks, such as the capacity-building of host countries, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration support, security sector reform and the strengthening of the rule of law, just to name a few areas. Contemporary traditional peacekeeping missions also face the new phenomenon of asymmetrical threats, which are a broad concept, subject to various interpretations. Therefore, we will limit our statement to the threat of terrorism, violent extremism and organized crime and its related activities, which peacekeeping operations, and in particular, the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali, must face.

The terrorist threat is real and has a significant impact on the security and the safety of Blue Helmets and civilian populations. As a troop-contributing country, Morocco is concerned about the increasing number of deaths among Blue Helmets and hopes that today's debate and discussions under way at the United Nations will enable us to remedy that unprecedented situation. Aware of the need to tailor peacekeeping operations to their current environment, we continue to firmly support the peacekeeping principles of impartiality, the consent of parties and the non-use of force, except in cases of legitimate defence and to uphold mandates. As highlighted in the concept note (see S/2016/927, annex), which contains an extract from the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (see S/2015/446), the challenge for peacekeeping operations today is to protect themselves against asymmetrical threats rather than combat such threats.

The current trend is to develop concepts and measures that steer us away from the principles of peacekeeping. Some solutions proposed could have a significant impact on the ground if they are clearly implemented and based on consensus to avoid having peacekeeping operations and our Blue Helmets being considered belligerents and, by extension, targets. I will give two examples to illustrate my point.

The first is intelligence-gathering. Peacekeeping operations have always gathered intelligence and analysed information. A number of mechanisms exist, including the Joint Mission Analysis Cell, the Joint Operations Centre, U-2 surveillance planes, among others. Mindful of the specific situation of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali, an intelligence-gathering unit attached to the Mission — the All Sources Information Fusion Unit (ASIFU) — has been deployed. Unfortunately, it has not had the expected result for a number of reasons, on which we will not dwell in this debate. However, the experience did underscore the importance of clear modalities in this area in order to ensure that a number of challenges facing ASIFU are met, such as information-sharing, its ownership and knowledge of the field. We have had an opportunity to speak to those challenges repeatedly.

What the United Nations needs is to readapt existing resources and to make optimimum use of available information. The simple fact of using the term "intelligence" can lead to confusion and even undermine the very image of the Mission, which could be perceived as a party to the conflict. The same applies to cooperation with various United Nations entities committed to the fight against terrorism or institutions, such as Interpol. It is necessary to clarify the terms of

that cooperation and ensure that they conform to the principles of peacekeeping.

The second point I wish to make concerns the use of new technologies. We often hear that peacekeeping cannot meet the challenges of the twenty-first century with the tools of the twentieth. I believe that we all agree on that. Where opinions diverge is with respect to the operationalization of those resources. When one refers to new technologies, we often think of drones, which are modern tools that can be very effective in surveillance and have demonstrated their utility in certain situations. However, some are reticent regarding their use as a result of the fact that to date, even though they have been deployed in three missions, there are still no clear modalities for their use. Many questions linked to confidentiality regarding the use of drones or their scope of application have not yet been addressed. We therefore take this opportunity to reiterate our call for discussions on the topic, especially in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, which is the only body that can take decisions in that field. Other modern technological resources, such as sophisticated surveillance cameras or protection equipment, could also be used.

This debate is taking place at just the right time, as discussions on the future of United Nations peacekeeping are under way. Following the review process launched by the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, we are all called on to consider the ways in which we can make peacekeeping more effective and better tailored to new realities. To this end, allow me to share a few thoughts for our consideration as part of our debate here today.

First, we should improve our understanding of the threats facing missions by enhancing our preliminary studies of the theatre of enagement. That process should not be confused with intelligence-gathering. It will also facilitate mission planning, and take into account all specific aspects of the engagement.

Secondly we should establish conditions conducive to promoting contact and communication with local populations. Indeed, local populations remain the main source of information. In that framework, it is important to include languages as part of the criteria for the selection of contingents, in particular French, a language that is used in most peacekeeping operations.

Thirdly, we should ensure that the troops deployed have the necessary equipment, based on the preliminary study of the field. In that respect, a statement of unit requirement could be considered in order to ensure that it take better into account the specificities of the location of deployment.

Fourthly, we should ensure that predeployment training is bolstered and adapted to the reality on the ground.

Fifthly, I stress the importance of ensuring that the principles of peacekeeping — including neutrality, impartiality, consent of the parties and the non-use of force, except in cases of legitimate self-defence and defence of the mandate— are respected. Certain mission tasks that transform the military personnel into targets are not acceptable.

Ms. Murmokaitė (Lithuania): I wish to thank the Senegalese delegation for organizing this highly pertinent open debate. As others have said, United Nations peacekeepers today operate in a much more challenging environment than at any time in peacekeeping history and increasingly in areas where there is no peace to keep. The latest attacks and loss of life in Mali are yet another reminder of the threats that peacekeepers face.

In 2015, the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) report (see S/2015/446) and the report of the Expert Panel on Technology and Innovation in United Nations Peacekeeping spoke clearly of the need for change at all stages of mission life. Their recommendations, if realized, would help to improve missions' ability to deliver on their mandates and protect peacekeepers, who continue to lose their lives in the line of duty.

Lithuania associates itself with the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union. I would like to make the following statement in my national capacity.

If situational awareness is missing or flawed, mandate implementation, including the core protection of civilians function, will suffer. Force commanders will be handicapped in their decisions and in their ability to keep their troops out of harm's way. As the Expert Panel points out, aerial data, geospatial and geographic information and other remotely acquired data are of critical importance to any peacekeeping mission and should be available as a matter of course.

The use of technologies in peacekeeping would improve early warning, enhance the ability to detect, mitigate, deter and respond to threats of violence

against civilians, and protect the lives of peacekeepers themselves. That is especially pertinent where peacekeepers face asymmetric threats, which are a lot harder to predict and pin down without such data. We regret that the use of such date continues to elicit strong resistance from some Member States. Global Positioning System technology in mission vehicles, night-vision goggles, infrared capabilities and reliable cellular or satellite communications are needed to better tackle such threats. Furthermore, medical evacuation services must be readily available, especially when peacekeepers are operating in high-risk areas.

Improved technology use should go hand in hand with enhanced inter-agency information-sharing and better use of available data-sharing tools. Joint Mission Analysis Cell, Joint Operations Centre and geographic information systems stakeholderould be expeditiously and fully staffed and equipped to do their job. One should not have to wait for months to fill such positions, especially where asymmetrical threats are a daily reality to grapple with.

There is a clear urgency to address the threat of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) , starting from pre-deployment training all the way through, to counter-IED capabilities on the ground, including ground sensors, jammers, radars, convoy protection and the use of tactical drones in hazard areas. Troop- and police-contributing countries (TCCs/PCCs) should prepare and equip their contingents to operate in asymmetrical threat environments and adapt their standard operation procedures accordingly. The inclusion of counter-IED expert capacity in peace operations to train and advise TCCs/PCCs, as well as host nation security forces, is a necessity.

My delegation commends the efforts of the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) in mitigating IED risks in Mali, Somalia and elsewhere by providing expert support, training, mentorship and equipment to the peacekeepers deployed. Exploring and developing partnerships with other bodies and organizations that can offer relevant expertise and capacities to tackle the threat is important. A good example of cooperation is the route clearance e-learning course developed by the North American Treaty Organization (NATO) at the request of UNMAS. We note NATO's readiness to identify and develop further training opportunities, as per UNMAS needs and requests.

We welcome the establishment of the United Nations Peacekeeping Capabilities Readiness System, which enables a more dynamic process of interaction between United Nations Headquarters and Member States for ensuring the readiness and timely deployment of quality peacekeeping capabilities.

The safety of peacekeepers should be on the priorities list of the Security Council as it designs or adjusts peacekeeping mandates. Peacekeepers should not be left to fend for themselves against asymmetric threats. Numerous substantive recommendations to that effect already exist, including those contained in last year's HIPPO report and the report on the use of technologies in United Nations peacekeeping operations. At a time of increasingly scarce resources and the growing human cost of today's asymmetrical threats to peacekeeping, we simply cannot afford to keep commissioning new reports while ignoring their recommendations. The time is now to move from the should-do narrative to what has been done, what more needs to be done and how best to do it. Civilian victims and peacekeepers under attack need actions, not words.

Mr. Scappini Ricciardi (Paraguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of the Republic of Paraguay expresses its profound consternation over the recent attacks to United Nations peacekeeping missions in South Sudan, Mali, Togo and the Central African Republic, where civilian, police and military personnel have fallen victim. We also condemn those attacks, which violate international law and violate human rights. We express our condolences to the families and the Governments of those who lost their lives in the service of United Nations peacekeeping missions.

In an enviornment characterized by new threats created by emerging asymmetrical and hybrid conflicts that deepen old insecurities and turn peacekeeping operations and civilians into targets, addressing this debate with a practical and strategic approach is especially relevant. For that reason, my delegation congratulates Senegal's presidency of the Security Council for this initiative.

The Republic of Paraguay actively participates in nine United Nations peacekeeping operations, including in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, South Sudan, Afghanistan and the Central African Republic. We are convinced that peacekeeping operations are a way of making the purposes and principles in the Charter of the United Nations a reality. My country

is also convinced that peacekeeping operations must firmly adhere to the principles of the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-use of force except in legitimate self-defence and defence of the mandate. Peacekeeping operations must not fight terrorism — that is the task of States where terrorist groups are present. Nevertheless, peacekeeping operations must be prepared to face up to terrorism and thereby ensure that they comply with their mandates.

Paraguay is aware of this situation and attaches the utmost importance to the selection of the personnel to be deployed in peacekeeping operations, with consideration of their merits and skills, and provides them with specific training, including predeployment training on the protection of civilians. The training of troops once they are deployed in host countries must only be complementary to that received in their countries of origin. Furthermore, capacity is crucial — understood as the resources necessary to carry out a mandate. Therefore, via the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Secretariat must ensure that updated deployment manuals and accurate intelligence are provided, in cooperation with States and regional organizations, so that peacekeeping operations can effectively comply with their mandates. That responsibility is particularly important with regard to the peacekeeping missions deployed under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

Finally, the delegation of Paraguay calls on the delegations of Member States, on troop- and police-contributing States, on host States, the Security Council and the Secretariat to continue working together to ensure the necessary cooperation and adopt measures so that the contingents of peacekeeping operations, especially those deployed, as I mentioned previously, under Chapter VII of the Charter, receive the proper training, equipment and timely and appropriate information for the effective fulfilment of their mandates.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of South Africa.

Mr. Mminele (South Africa): My delegation would like to congratulate Senegal on assuming the presidency of the Security Council and to expresses its appreciation for the convening of this important and timely debate on peacekeeping operations and the asymmetrical threats facing them. We would also like to thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal and Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson or his pertinent remarks.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and wishes to make the following additional remarks in its national capacity.

In the 70 years since the establishment of the United Nations, the need for the Organization to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war has never been greater. This is manifested by the proliferation of conflicts and the deployment of more than 125,000 personnel in 38 United Nations political and peacekeeping missions.

South Africa holds the view that peacekeepers should be deployed in support of political or peace processes, thereby working for the objective of sustainable peace. We wish to state from the onset that it remains the primary responsibility of States to protect civilians within their borders, including against terrorist threats. As emphasized in the 2015 report (see S/2015/446) of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, United Nations missions should not be mandated to conduct military counter-terrorism operations, because they are not suited for such actions.

The nature of conflict is evolving and new asymmetrical threats to global peace and security continue to emerge, which threaten the peace and stability of States and regions. Recent acts of terrorism across the world and against peacekeeping missions have exposed the callous and heinous nature of terrorism. South Africa stands firmly with the rest of the international community in its condemnation of such attacks and reiterates its stance that terrorism, in whatever form and from whatever quarter, must be condemned.

The United Nations is presently deployed in a multitude of environments where it faces asymmetric and violent threats, as in Somalia, Libya, Mali, Iraq and Afghanistan. As the organ entrusted with the deployment of United Nations peacekeeping operations, the Security Council must ensure that these operations are fully resourced and entrusted with the appropriate mandate in order to respond to the context-specific environments in which they are deployed.

As a troop-contributing country, South Africa believes that we have a responsibility to ensure that

our troops have the capacity to operate in a secure environment. In the context of asymmetrical threats where our troops and United Nations personnel are vulnerable and the mandate of the peace operation is threatened, the mission must be sufficiently resourced and equipped to protect itself and defend its mandate. Also, if peace processes are obstructed and non-military protection tools are inadequate, peacekeeping missions with an explicit mandate to protect civilians must play their part in the protection of civilians, including through the use of force, as part of a robust response to these threats.

Clarity must also be sought with regard to the concept of stabilization. Numerous missions seem to struggle in finding a working balance between stabilization and military tasks, bearing in mind that stabilization requires additional civilian and police activities within the ambit of security sector reform. There is therefore a need for greater understanding surrounding the context and planning of a peacekeeping mission before deployment.

Furthermore, in this modern age, we should make use of all relevant resources, including the use of technology, in order to enhance the effectiveness of United Nations peace operations in responding to asymmetrical threats. The deployment of the Force Intervention Brigade of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a credible example of the success that could be achieved to address potential threats to a peace mission.

South Africa recognizes that the primary responsibility for international peace and security lies with the Security Council. However, at the same time, it is often regional organizations, such as the African Union (AU), that are the first responders and deploy early in order to stabilize conflict situations, as necessary, thereby enabling the United Nations to deploy when conditions are more favourable. Concerning, therefore, is the reluctance of the Council to fully fund AU-led peace operations that are carried out on behalf of the international community. In that regard, South Africa calls for the use of United Nations-assessed contributions to secure predictable, sustainable and flexible financing for AU peace operations authorized by the Security Council.

In conclusion, my country reiterates its view that terrorism and violent extremism cannot be defeated militarily and cannot be dealt with solely through the use of force or coercive measures. We believe that the only way for collective efforts to succeed is to address the root causes through international cooperation. Promoting political solutions aimed at resolving conflict and creating the conditions for a better future for all over the long term will go a long way towards countering asymmetrical threats.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Israel.

Mr. Roet (Israel): I would like to begin by expressing Israel's immense appreciation to the courageous men and women of United Nations peacekeeping forces, in our area and worldwide. They risk their lives to protect civilians and to maintain stability and security in hotspots around the world. We applaud their courage and their willingness to dedicate their lives to the promotion of peace, and we pray for their safe return home to their families and loved ones.

I would also like to thank the Senegal and the President of the Security Council for convening this important debate.

It has become increasingly urgent in recent years to deal with this issue. For Israel, asymmetrical threats are not just a theoretical notion, but a very real and important issue. Israel has been living with the reality of such terrorist threats for many years, on all fronts. As we cope with this unfortunate reality on a daily basis, so do the United Nations peacekeeping missions that operate within Israel and in its neighbouring States — the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF). The problematic security environment created by terrorist groups and non-State actors in the area endangers United Nations personnel as well as their peacekeeping operations.

UNIFIL plays a key role in upholding resolution 1701 (2006) and helps maintain stability in our conflict-fraught region. Operating in southern Lebanon, a territory that is controlled by a terrorist organization, requires both courage and commitment. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the troop-contributing countries for their ongoing support, and UNIFIL Force Commander Major General Michael Beary of Ireland for his leadership and efforts to ensure stability in the region. I would also like to emphasize that Israel is committed to fully cooperate with UNIFIL and is ready to collaborate in preparation for the upcoming strategic review in February.

While recognizing the important role of UNIFIL, we must not forget that there is still much work to be done on this front, as the internationally designated terror organization Hizbullah, a proxy of Iran, remains a primary factor of instability and chaos in the region. In paragraph 8 of resolution 1701 (2006), the Council called for

> "the disarmament of all armed groups in Lebanon, so that ... there will be no weapons or authority in Lebanon other than that of the Lebanese State".

Unfortunately, as we have stated many times in the past in the Chamber, the resolution has never beem fully implemented. In fact, even though there are more than 10,000 UNIFIL peacekeepers on the ground, Hizbullah increased its arsenal from 7,000 rockets to over 120,000 in the 10 years since the adoption of resolution 1701 (2006) — I repeat, 120,000 rockets.

Hizbullah is embedding its arsenal in the civilian infrastructure of southern Lebanon, stationing rocket launchers and storing weapons caches in or adjacent to schools, hospitals and private homes. We have, in the past, provided the Council maps that prove that fact beyond a shadow of a doubt. Yet, regardless of that proof and the extensive presence of UNIFIL in the area, we do not see that information reflected in UNIFIL reports. That error must be corrected. What we do see in the reports is a worrisome trend of obstructing UNIFIL's movement in southern Lebanon. These incidents prevent UNIFIL from fulfilling its mandate in full. We expect UNIFIL to report on any and all such incidents that compromise its ability to properly monitor the area and to provide a comprehensive account of the situation on the ground.

Hizbullah has made it clear, in word and deed, that it not only aspires to attack Israel with rockets from Lebanese territory, but that it is also actively trying to carry out attacks within Israeli territory. Just last month, it came to light that Hizbullah had created a terror infrastructure in Ghajar village. Hizbullah operatives recruited individuals from the village who were involved in drug trafficking and instructed them to carry out deadly terror attacks in the city of Haifa, Israel's third most-populated city, and other potential locations in the heart of Israel. It is only thanks to the vigilance of Israeli security forces that those deadly attacks were prevented and many lives were saved.

Hizbullah poses a threat not only to the people of Israel and Lebanon but to the stability of the entire region. That organization, founded and supplied by Iran, has been taking part in the conflicts in Yemen and Syria, assisting the Al-Assad regime in ruthlessly slaughtering the Syrian people and prolonging the devastating war in Yemen.

Hizbullah's connection to Iran is no longer a secret — it is actually proud of it and openly speaks about it. Its leader, Hassan Nasrallah, admitted himself that

> "Hizbullah's budget, its income, its expenses ... come from the Islamic Republic of Iran. ... Just as we receive the rockets that we use to threaten Israel, we are receiving our money".

These words constitute not only a violation of Lebanon's obligations under resolutions 1559 (2004) and 1701 (2006), but also a violation by Iran of resolution 2231 (2015), which prohibits Iran from transferring arms or related materials. Lebanon, a United Nations Member State that claims to be a sovereign and independent State, cannot be absolved of its responsibility to uphold those resolutions nor of its duty not to allow a terrorist organization in its midst.

The United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, which was put in place to ensure the upholding of the 1974 ceasefire agreement between Syria and Israel, has experienced the devastating effects of a war-torn country. Following the kidnapping of UNDOF personnel from the Philippines and Fiji by terrorist groups in Syria in 2013 and 2014, respectively, and the inability of the Syrian regime to ensure the safety of the peacekeepers, the peacekeeping mission was forced to withdraw from the area of separation. As such, UNDOF has been operating solely on the Israeli side of the Golan Heights since September 2014.

Since then, Israel has been supporting and facilitating the work of UNDOF and will continue its support in order to allow UNDOF to carry out its mandate safely and securely. We welcome the Department of Peacekeeping Operations decision to begin a gradual return to the area of separation and will continue to work with UNDOF in order to facilitate a gradual and coordinated redeployment. Israel understands that UNDOF requires security guarantees for the mission's personnel in the light of the situation in Syria, and therefore has established temporary procedures for their crossing between the Alfa and Bravo sides in order to facilitate their movement.

UNDOF plays a crucial role in maintaining stability along the border, especially given the series of spillover attacks from Syria to Israel, which have unfortunately increased over the past year. During the month of September alone there was a total of six instances in which rockets launched from Syria landed next to towns and villages inside Israeli territory, thus risking the lives of Israeli citizens. Thankfully, thus far, such rocket attacks have not resulted in casualties.

I would like to reiterate that Israel holds the Government of Syria responsible for all actions that take place within Syrian territory, and demands that the Syrian regime abide by the 1974 Disengagement of Forces Agreement between Israeli and Syrian Forces. We will not tolerate any kind of spillover from Syria, and will take all the necessary measures to protect our civilians from harm.

Let me take this opportunity to thank the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Member States that contribute troops in order to maintain the United Nations presence and activities, despite the unstable situation in Syria. We also thank UNDOF Force Commander Major General Jai Shanker Menon of India for his strong leadership in the light of the many challenges he faces.

We cannot confront the evil of today with the equipment and technology of yesterday. In too many cases, United Nations peacekeepers lack the equipment and technology to fulfil their mandate and to fully protect both civilians and themselves. Israel looks forward to supporting United Nations peacekeeping operations in their important work, and has much to offer in terms of cutting-edge technology, the protection of civilians and the protection of peacekeepers. Israel is working together with the United Nations in the area of medical assistance to provide first-aid training to United Nations staff in order to standardize that important skill set throughout all United Nations peacekeeping missions. Israel has also recently offered to assist the United Nations in reducing the ecological footprint of its peacekeeping operations by introducing Israeli technology in the areas of renewable energy and water treatment. We look forward to continuing to engageme and cooperate with United Nations peackeeping missions in those areas and others. While we recognize the important role that peacekeeping missions play in maintaining international peace and security, we pray that one day our children will live in a world in which peacekeeping missions will no longer be needed.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Gambia.

Mr. Tangara (Gambia): As an opening salvo, I wish to congratulate the Republic of Senegal on assuming the presidency of the Security Council. We are confident, Sir, that, given the pivotal role being played by Senegal in global peace and security and the renowned international credentials of your Foreign Minister, Mr. Mankeur Ndiaye, this debate will go down in the annals of Security Council deliberations as one of the most insightful and productive.

Today's debate on "Peace operations — facing asymmetrical threats" is timely. The concept of peacekeeping was launched by the United Nations to douse the flames of inter- or intra-State conflicts, save lives and property and facilitate and foster reconciliation and reconstruction. In line with that vision, the brave men and women known as the Blue Helmets of the United Nations are at the front line of conflicts, risking their lives daily and, at times, paying the ultimate price. Unfortunately, the theatres of peacekeeping operations have been radically changed and compromised by serious challenges involving violent and fatal attacks on United Nations peacekeeping troops. The situation is so serious that in certain zones of conflict our peacekeepers are more preoccupied with protecting themselves than with implementing their mandate. Several factors can be identified for the deteriorating security environment in countries in which there are United Nations peacekeeping operations.

To start with, many, if not most, of the countries with peacekeeping operations are plagued with multiple rebel movements that have carved out fiefdoms, thus threatening national cohesion. Criminal gangs have also weighed into the equation by taking advantage of security lapses to further their criminal enterprises. The peacekeeping environment is also compounded by the proliferation of arms, and, in many instances, the national army, which should handle national security, is ill-equipped to handle the situation. Another worrying development is the involvement of terrorist groups in peacekeeping areas. In Mali, for example, we have seen how terrorists can wreak havoc on a country and peacekeepers. It is disheartening to recall how rampaging terrorists in Mali desecrated mosques and holy shrines, vandalized historical monuments and set

on fire ancient libraries and artifacts. Their attacks on United Nations peacekeepers have been roundly condemned, and we again raise our voice to reiterate our condemnation.

The Gambia wishes to reiterate the call for collective action against terrorism and criminals who attack United Nations peacekeepers. Terrorism has no regard for humankind. Criminals bent on peddling drugs and profiting from human trafficking and other nefarious activities will continue to attack United Nations peacekeepers, who are perceived as obstacles to their evil enterprises.

(*spoke in French*)

Although United Nations peacekeepers are not involved in Nigeria in the fight against Boko Haram, we all know of the ongoing situation in that country, and we commend the concerted efforts of the Niger, Nigeria, Chad and Cameroon in combating that domestic enemy. It is an enemy that sleeps and eats among us but, given the slightest opportunity, when our guard is down, attacks. It is therefore important to work collectively in the area of information-sharing networks.

(*spoke in English*)

We therefore call on all countries, especially those in the subregion, to work on establishing a network of information-sharing so that we can find the enemy who lives among us.

All the lapses and atrocities that I have enumerated are possible because of the existence of porous borders, which allows the free movement of rebels and their weapons.

We place a high premium on United Nations peacekeeping operations because they are an effective way to save countries from disintegration. It is an effective way to prevent war and civil strife. Indeed, it is an effective way to protect the weak and the innocent. However, despite all their merit, peacekeeping operations will continue to be under threat unless concrete actions are taken to revamp their mandate and bolster their strength to make them not only a deterrent force, but also a force of potency wherever the need arises. That is not a call to make our peacekeepers into counter-terrorism forces. Rather, it is meant to address the charge that, if peacekeepers cannot protect or defend themselves, then they cannot be expected to protect and defend innocent civilians. The Gambia is of the view that, for peacekeeping operations to be effective and for peacekeepers to be safe, the following factors must be allowed to prevail.

First, in the planning and deployment of a peacekeeping force, the Security Council should consider arming peacekeepers with weapons that can match the lethal force of rebels, terrorists and criminal gangs who may attacks civilians or peacekeepers.

Secondly, as a matter of urgency, the Security Council should set up a military panel composed of reputable senior experts to review the rules of engagement in peacekeeping operations and set out the modalities for the protection of peacekeepers.

Thirdly, the Security Council should also consider setting up regional rapid deployment forces that can be mobilized to enter a country in which peacekeepers may be under siege or in danger.

Fourthly, countries agreeing to a United Nations peacekeeping force must be made to enter into an agreement with the United Nations to undertake judicial reforms to facilitate peace and the rule of law.

The Security Council should also exercise leverage to get countries in conflict to embrace peace by setting up peace and reconciliation councils.

There are many other suggestions to be made, but we believe that this set of proposals is fundamental to a comprehensive review to address the asymmetrical threats to peace operations.

In conclusion, no task currently undertaken by the United Nations is more noble than that of peacekeeping, and I wish to put on record the appreciation of the Gambia for the invaluable contribution of Blue Helmets to world peace and security.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Mali.

Mr. Konfourou (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I would like to begin by conveying to you, Sir, the regret of His Excellency Mr. Abdoulaye Diop, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mali, who, because of conflicts in his schedule, was not able to be with us this afternoon. Nevertheless, he has asked me to warmly congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of Mali on the assumption of your beautiful country, the Republic of Senegal, to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November, as well as to welcome the convening of this ministerial-level debate on the problem of asymmetrical threats to United Nations peace operations. Before continuing, allow me

to commend the Russian delegation for its outstanding presidency of the Council last month. In the same vein, I acknowledge and thank those who spoke and shared their knowledge with us this morning.

On behalf of the Government of Mali, I thank all those delegations that expressed their compassion and solidarity with my country following the deadly attacks of the past several days. I also take this opportunity to express the heartfelt condolences of the people of Mali to the Governments of France and Togo for the loss of their soldiers in Mali. I also acknowledge the mourning families of my own countrymen.

The timeliness and relevance of this subject are self-evident, particularly with regard to Mali, which, as everyone knows, has hosted the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) since 1 July 2013. Yesterday, a MINUSMA logistical convoy was unfortunately once again the subject of a new attack from improvised explosive devices. We deplore that act, which resulted in three deaths, including a Togolese Blue Helmet and two Malian civilians, as well as seven wounded. On the same day, a camp of Malian armed and security forces was attacked at 2 a.m. by unidentified armed men. On 5 November, a French soldier unfortunately fell in the field of honour, following the explosion of a mine as his convoy drove through it.

That has been the situation day after day in Mali; the indiscriminate asymmetric attacks are the daily reality of the civilian population, the Malian defence and security forces, the French Operation Barkhane force and MINUSMA. As the President stated this morning, the toll in human lives and property from these indiscriminate asymmetrical attacks are very heavy. With more than 58 MINUSMA personnel lost between 2015 and 2016, Mali is the country considered the most dangerous for United Nations personnel. The French force has lost 18 men since January 2013. The Malian defence and security forces, as well as the civilian population, have paid the highest price, with hundreds dead or wounded. And I cannot fail to mention the contemptible targeting and desecration of my country's historic monuments, which have suffered substantial damage.

Those statistics send shivers down one's spine. They cry out to the human conscience, especially as no one can predict the end of such multiple asymmetrical attacks and attacks using improvised explosive devices, followed by a barrage of automatic weapon fire.

The people of Mali are not proud that Mali, once a haven of peace and stability, has been called the most dangerous country, particularly for children, by friendly nations coming to aid us to re-establish peace in our country. The Government of Mali has therefore not ceased alerting the United Nations and other partners about the need to adapt the MINUSMA mandate to its difficult, dangerous and complex environment. In that regard, the Government of Mali welcomes the fact that the Security Council acted to accede to its demand by adopting resolution 2295 (2016), which gives a more proactive and robust posture to MINUSMA in the execution of its mandate. In that regard, I would like to note that the adaptation of the MINUSMA mandate to its environment aims first at protecting the Mission itself, its personnel and its facilities against repeated attacks carried out by hostile forces, in a way that allows it then to face other dimensions of its mandate, including the protection of civilian populations.

It is not, as we have often understood, a matter of MINUSMA carrying out a counter-terrorism mission. We know that a peacekeeping mission is not supposed to carry out counter-terrorism activities. Nevertheless, it has the duty and the responsibility of taking all useful measures to protect and to normally carry out its mandate.

It is worrisome to observe that, five months after its adoption by the Security Council, the relevant provisions of resolution 2295 (2016) have yet to come together. How could we but not be worried at seeing the alarming lack of equipment, in particular in terms of armoured vehicles to transport troops and logistical support, as well as other essential logistical equipment. Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Hervé Ladsous noted as much during his presentation of the Secretary-General's latest report (S/2016/819) on the the situation in Mali (see S/PV.7784) on 6 October. Along the same lines, the announced withdrawal of three of the five helicopter units currently in the theatre of operations and the lack of attack helicopters constitute serious sources of concern. I would like to welcome the ray of hope provided by Germany and Canada in that regard.

The theatre of operations in Mali also requires that deployed contingents be provided with appropriate equipment and tailored training, while meeting United

Nations standards, including on aerial equipment. It also requires intelligence-sharing and the use of adapted technology, in particular when it comes to drones and surveillance cameras.

The Government of Mali is fully aware of its primary responsibility for the protection of civilians and for securing its national territory. It is also aware that the fight against terrorism in our country falls first and foremost to Mali's defence and security forces and the relevant competent national institutions — in such sectors as the judiciary, the financial and intelligence services and customs. The Government is therefore working tirelessly every day, with the very appreciated support from partners, to rebuild and strengthen the operational capacity of our forces and that of the whole host of national agencies concerned, with the aim of enabling them to fulfil their sovereign duties to protect the civilian population and their property and to secure the entirety of our national territory. In that regard, I would like to commend the significant support from our bilateral and multilateral partners, notably the European Union through the European Union military mission to contribute to the training of the Malian Armed Forces, as well as that of the United Nations.

However, there must be no mistaking that effectiveness in the fight against terrorism, violent extremism and all types of trafficking that fuel organized crime lies in cooperation with neighbouring countries and in subregional, regional and international cooperation. In that regard, the Group of Five for the Sahel is a prime example. Its joint force has been put together as a tool adapted to the security environment in the region. However, other important subregional and regional mechanisms are planned, including the African Standby Force — the military pillar of the African Union Peace and Security Architecture — as well as the Joint Military Staff Committee of the Sahel Region, charged with coordinating counter-terrorism military efforts in Algeria, Mali, Mauritania and the Niger.

That subregional cooperation dynamic also includes mixed and joint patrols along the common borders with neighbouring countries, which also includes the right of pursuit and intelligence-sharing. It is also quite important to work together to prevent and combat the root causes of those criminal activities in our societies, among them extreme poverty, unemployment especially among youth, exclusion, marginalization, ignorance and so on.

The Malian people remain eternally grateful to all friendly nations for the ultimate sacrifices paid by their children for peace and stability in Mali. We will never forget these blood sacrifices, and we pay tribute to all the victims who have fallen on the field of honour in Mali. Finally, on behalf of the Government of Mali, I welcome the outstanding work done by MINUSMA in an environment that I know is especially difficult.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. Bosah (Nigeria): I thank the delegation of Senegal for convening this open debate and for the excellent concept note (S/2016/927, annex) provided to guide our discussion. We commend the Deputy Secretary-General for sharing with us his perspectives on this subject. Our appreciation also goes to the Secretary-General of the International Organization of La Francophonie, the Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate, as well as all the other briefers.

Please convey, Mr. President, to His Excellency Mr. Mankeur Ndiaye the best wishes of my Foreign Minister, Mr. Geoffrey Onyeama, who regrets not being able to attend this meeting.

Since their inception, United Nations peace operations have been a vital part of the global security architecture. They serve as an inspiration and source of hope for victims of conflicts. It is incumbent upon all concerned to ensure that peace operations remain relevant now and in the future. This requires the collective efforts of United Nations States Member to surmount the existing and emerging challenges, including the increasing asymmetrical attacks, which have grown in both complexity and severity. Nigeria therefore welcomes this important debate focused on seeking ways to strengthen the capacity of United Nations peacekeeping operations to curb the increase in asymmetrical threats, particularly in the context of implementing civilian-protection mandates.

Although the United Nations has faced terrorist attacks over the years, transnational terrorist networks pose a fundamentally different threat than other non-State armed groups that United Nations peacekeepers typically face. In addition, their links with transnational organized crime and their use of asymmetrical tactics have a substantial operational impact upon United Nations field missions.

The United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali raised concerns about the need to address the challenges of implementing complex mandates in operational theaters where transnational terrorist networks are active. In the coming years, there is a strong likelihood that the United Nations will be asked to deploy field missions and increase its presence in environments characterized as a seat of transnational terrorist networks. Given the complexity of the challenges posed by transnational terrorist threats, we deem it necessary for the Secretary-General and the Security Council to prioritize actions that will have an immediate and lasting impact.

Preventive action should mark the trail of essential measures taken to inhibit transnational terrorist networks from destabilizing vulnerable States, including strengthening of political mechanisms to address grievances, population security and the re-establishment of State authority. We also underline the need for an improved understanding of the context in predeployment mission planning, including through liaison and cooperation with regional organizations. Missions should be able to adequately monitor occurrences in the environment, by deploying intelligence capacities and ensuring that they are well integrated in the mission.

In spite of the daunting challenges, United Nations peace operations have proved to serve as a flexible and adaptable tool that has evolved over time to respond to evolving challenges. In that vein, contemporary United Nations field operations need to continually adapt to sometimes rapidly changing circumstances on the ground. As peacekeepers find themselves in environments where they face increased challenges, each situation will require its own specialized mix of skills and experience.

We would like to conclude by paying tribute to the peacekeepers who lost their lives in the line of duty, including the civilians in the recent attack in Mali. We offer our deepest condolences to their families, friends and Governments. We salute the courage of peacekeepers, who sometimes find themselves serving in hostile environments and in extremely difficult conditions.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Ethiopia.

Ms. Guadey (Ethiopia): Let me join others in congratulating Senegal on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. I also wish to express appreciation to the Senegalese delegation for organizing this open debate on an issue of critical importance, particularly for us in Africa. I wish to thank the Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of the International Organization of La Francophonie, as well as the Executive Directors of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime for their briefings.

This open debate could not be more timely and relevant in the light of the unprecedented challenges faced by peacekeepers — whether in Mali, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of Congo, South Sudan or Somalia — who are operating in a very complex and dynamic security terrain. Asymmetrical threats from non-State actors, including terrorists, negative forces and other transnational criminal networks, are not only posing serious risks to peacekeepers, but also threatening the lives of innocent civilians.

That is why United Nations peacekeeping needs to be reformed and adapted to the changing security environment. In that regard, the review of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) has certainly made important recommendations whose timely implementation will go a long way in making United Nations peace operations fit for purpose. Of course, we know that the Panel advised caution in mandating enforcement tasks to United Nations peacekeepers, particularly in counter-terrorism operations. Nevertheless, the number of targeted attacks against peacekeepers and civilians is on the increase, and asymmetrical threats are increasingly becoming the norm rather than the exception for many peacekeepers, if not all of them. Yesterday's incident against peacekeepers of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) underscores the fact that responding to this new challenge is no longer an option, and devising the right strategic and operational interventions has never been so critical. In that context, we would like to point out the following.

First, the need for pragmatic and flexible interpretation of the basic principles of United Nations peacekeeping cannot be overemphasized. The debate over traditional peacekeeping versus peace enforcement is untenable. Peacekeepers cannot be, and should not remain, indifferent in the face of significant threats to

themselves or to the innocent civilians whom they are supposed to protect.

Secondly, peacekeepers should have a clear mandate, concept of operation and rules of engagement based on a thorough analysis of the situation, threat assessment and planning. That will allow them to have a robust posture in defending themselves and protecting civilians in the face of mortal danger. However, having a clear mandate, concept of operation and rules of engagement is not enough.

My third point, therefore, is that peacekeepers must have the necessary training and capabilities, including force enablers and multipliers, to enable their operation in an asymmetrical environment.

We know that such things are easier said than done, and we have no illusion that strategic and operational challenges will be easily overcome. But in the light of the seriousness of the matter, it is imperative that those challenges be addressed as expeditiously as possible. The problem cannot be ignored or swept under the carpet. Doing so would leave the commitment to protect civilians unfulfilled.

Although the HIPPO report (see S/2015/446) recommended against United Nations peacekeepers undertaking counter-terrorism operations, it did not rule out such a possibility by capable regional forces and/or ad hoc coalitions authorized by the Security Council. The African Union and its regional mechanisms, for instance, have shown greater commitment and readiness to deploy forces in an asymmetrical environment, with the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) being a case in point. No mission symbolizes a greater need for partnership than AMISON — a mission that is operating in one of the most hostile environments on behalf of the international community. AMISOM peacekeepers face asymmetrical attacks on nearly a daily basis, yet they are underfunded and in dire logistical conditions.

Based on the principles of complementarity and a division of labour, the United Nations should be ready to share the burden with the AU-led peace support operations, among others, by providing a financial and logistical package. In that connection, the relevant recommendations set out in the HIPPO report are a step in the right direction; therefore, it is absolutely necessary that they be translated into concrete action.

We are aware, of course, of the ongoing discussion between the two organizations on enhancing their strategic partnership, including in peacekeeping, and look forward to the outcome of the Security Council debate scheduled for 18 November, under the Senegalese presidency.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Haiti.

Mr. Régis (Haiti) (*spoke in French*): First of all, on behalf of the Haitian delegation, I would like to welcome Senegal's initiative, a country with which Haiti has strong ties, to organize this debate under into the framework of the necessary consideration of asymmetrical threats with a direct impact on the maintenance of international peace and security.

One of the first items that caught our eye when taking a retrospective look at United Nations efforts in peacekeeping matters during recent decades is the magnitude of the tasks carried out in all continents and all domains pertaining to the maintenance of peace. The successes, some of which have been resounding, were many. However, we cannot ignore the partial successes — what one might even refer to as failures — due in some cases to gaps and strategic and operational shortcomings that clearly demand our attention in terms of the need to deepen our collective understanding. The successes and failures, past and present, are replete with lessons to be learned and must be used to help the Organization, the Security Council in particular, as well as the States concerned to better shoulder their responsibilities in peacekeeping and in the protection of populations.

Today we are witnessing a proliferation of conflicts of a political, ethnic or religious nature, often accompanied by violence committed against civilians, which make peacekeeping operations increasingly complex. In the vast majority of cases these are armed conflicts bereft of any international character; rather they are conflicts of an internal or intra-State nature. The Secretary-General recalled recently that over two thirds of United Nations military, police and civilian personnel deployed throughout the world were concentrated in places where there was in fact no peace, and where the deployment of operations takes place in the absence of clearly identified parties to a conflict, or of any viable political process. In several cases, troops deployed by the United Nations face situations of violence, conflict and so-called asymmetrical threats,

which tend to compromise the success of the efforts invested by the international community.

That increased complexity of peacekeeping operations, which is unanimously recognized, is also due to the growing power of non-State entities, such as the Islamic State, which is a prime illustration of the new threats to peace. Asymmetrical threats, above all terrorism, mean higher risks for Blue Helmets, as reflected by the surge in recent years of attacks against peacekeeping personnel in different parts of the world — in Mali, in the Golan Heights, in the Central African Republic, in Somalia, in Darfur and elsewhere.

Today peacekeepers are called upon to carry out increasingly greater missions and tasks. In some cases, the gaps in mandates are in plain sight, and sometimes call into question, as we have seen in Rwanda or more recently in South Sudan, the very capacity of the United Nations to properly respond to asymmetrical threats that flow from such multidimensional and complex environments.

That is why it seems to be a timely moment for the international community to engage in an in-depth consideration, as we are doing today, to adopt robust measures to strengthen the capacities and resources of Blue Helmets and to allow them to operate in increasingly complex environments and to grapple with emerging challenges to peacekeeping, above all asymmetrical threats — whether from terrorism, organized crime or other sources. It is a matter of ensuring that peacekeepers are better protected in discharging their mandates with regard to security issues, the protection of civilians, the rule of law, guaranteeing human rights and significantly improving the capacities of countries emerging from conflict.

The Republic of Haiti has been hosting the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti for 12 years now. Our experience over these years has allowed us to learn many lessons that can prove beneficial at a time where there is increasing clamour for what has become an urgent necessity, namely, redefining United Nations peacekeeping mandates and developing new, better tailored tools that allow peacekeeping missions to improve their effectiveness in a global environment that is in constant flux.

While welcoming the role played by the Security Council as part of its fundamental mission of collective security through peacekeeping operations, allow me to highlight the invaluable contribution of two Member States of the Organization that once remained outside peacekeeping operations themselves. I want to single out Japan and Mexico. Japan is already a major financial donor to peacekeeping missions, while within the region and beyond Mexico enjoys a solid reputation of impartiality that has already proved its worth.

In conclusion, let me set out a few thoughts that my delegation considers to be essential:

First, peacekeeping is not only a matter of increasing budgets, but also of taking into account new requirements, both in terms of security management, training peacekeepers, their involvement in the process of establishing the rule of law and sustainable development.

Secondly, the effectiveness and success of peacekeeping operations requires, above all, respect for the key principles defined by the Charter of the United Nations, including the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-useof force.

Thirdly, my delegation also believes it is crucial that peacekeepers be by the side of the communities and civilians they are mandated to protect.

Fourthly, the root causes of conflict, such as underdevelopment, extreme poverty, marginalization and exclusion, must be treated as priorities.

Fifthly, the role of police contingents is paramount when it comes to rebuilding the rule of law, establishing long-term stability and consolidating democracy. The protection of civilians mus lie at the heart of our priorities.

Finally, the onus lies with all Member States to ensure that peacekeeping tasks correspond better to the realities of this day and age in the light of the new threats to peace, especially the so-called asymmetrical threats.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Ms. Bird (Australia): Recurrent intra-State conflicts, expanded terrorist and extremist networks and the deliberate targeting of civilians define global security today. United Nations peacekeepers are facing unprecedented demands, more complex and dangerous environments and significant fatalities through malicious acts.

Seven of the 11 countries most affected by terrorism host United Nations peacekeeping operations,

even though the report (see S/2015/446) of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations and the Secretary-General agreed that United Nations peacekeeping operations were not designed to counter terrorism.

Violent and asymmetrical threat environments should not weaken our resolve to create political space for peace negotiations and to protect civilians. But we must also train and equip peacekeepers to operate as safely and effectively as possible. There is an urgent need for consistent and relevant training, greater situational awareness and improved crisis management.

First, with regard to training, we need to ensure that peacekeepers meet United Nations predeployment standards and that they are able to respond to the specific threats they will face. We support the standardization efforts under way, in particular the deployment of United Nations military unit manuals and associated training. Australia is co-chairing the drafting of the improvised explosive device (IED) threat mitigation military and police Headquarters handbook, which will help peacekeepers detect and defeat terrorists' weapon of choice.

Secondly, Australia strongly supports the findings of the *Final Report of the Expert Panel on Technology and Innovation in United Nations Peacekeeping*, which recommends the use of technology to improve situational awareness and protect peacekeepers, in particular where such technology provides low-burden, low-cost force protection. Under Australia's REDWING programme, for example, a suite of practical counter-IED devices that operate in austere environments was developed. The use of unmanned aerial vehicles and night-vision equipment are also particularly important.

Enhanced intelligence is key to ensuring that peacekeeping operations are better positioned to prevent and counter asymmetrical attacks. We also encourage efforts to improve engagement with local communities, which builds trust and is an important part of broader early warning and conflict prevention. Thirdly, while prevention is key to countering the threat, in the event of a security crisis, the United Nations needs the flexibility and resources to boost security and medical capacities, including quick-reaction forces and medical evacuation capabilities. A comprehensive policy on crisis management, including mandatory crisis-management exercises, is an important step. We also welcome the development of a medical performance framework for improving standards across health-care capabilities. The lack of medical evacuation capability that can operate 24/7 and in all weathers remains a critical gap.

Fragile States hosting peace operations are vulnerable to terrorist and violent extremist networks. We support a more strategic and coherent approach across the United Nations in its efforts to prevent terrorism and violent extremism, and acknowledge the need to strengthen cooperation and coordination among United Nations counter-terrorism and peacekeeping bodies. The Secretary-General's recommendation that the prevention of violent extremism be integrated into the relevant activities of United Nations peacekeeping operations, in accordance with their mandates, merits further consideration.

In conclusion, peacekeeping is a high-risk venture at the core of the mission of the United Nations to maintain peace and security. In asking peacekeepers to face such risks, we must give them the means to do their job as safely and effectively as possible.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. Bonser (Canada): We have heard many speakers today, and I promise I will be brief.

Peacekeepers operate in increasingly complex and volatile environments, often putting themselves in harm's way to protect vulnerable civilian populations. As many have said today, asymmetrical threats will continue to be a critical risk to peace operations for the foreseeable future. Both the United Nations and personnel-contributing countries must therefore urgently adapt to such threats. The objective is clearly not to make peace operations a substitute for counter-terrorism initiatives but to ensure that deployed personnel can carry out their missions as efficiently and safely as possible.

In order to ensure both the sustainability of deployed personnel and the successful delivery of robust mandates, in particular with regard to the protection of civilians, the United Nations must enhance missions' preparation, performance and responsiveness through an integrated and tailored approach. That approach means developing adequate conceptual frameworks and providing specialized training as well as the equipment, intelligence and enabling capabilities needed to effectively meet asymmetrical threats. The

United Nations must also strengthen its analytical capacity in that area.

(spoke in French)

We must also ensure that our approach to asymmetrical threats is not confined to the security front. It is vital that the full range of factors that can lead to violent extremism be addressed through a comprehensive approach. Canada is always ready to share relevant lessons learned in dealing with asymmetrical threats in Afghanistan, and would welcome the opportunity to gain from the experience of its various partners present today.

The President *(spoke in French)*: I now give the floor to the representative of Côte d'Ivoire.

Mr. Gone (Côte d'Ivoire) *(spoke in French)*: At the outset, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your delegation's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month, and to express our confidence in the effectiveness with which you will lead the Council's work. My delegation is ready to assist you in carrying out your task. We are very pleased to be participating in today's open debate on the subject of peace operations facing asymmetrical threats, giving us an opportunity to discuss this important topic.

The frequency and complexity of the increasingly murderous acts of violence committed against civilians and peacekeeping operations personnel by anonymous combatants who belong to no legal, recognized institutions have become a real concern at a time when there has been a sharp increase in violent conflicts. President Alassane Ouattara drew the international community's attention to the issue of terrorism and asymmetrical threats with his reference, in the general debate of the General Assembly at its seventy-first session, to the terrorist attack at Grand Bassam in Côte d'Ivoire, noting that

> "[t]he world must mobilize against terrorism and fight it with the utmost resolve and determination before it inflicts irreparable damage and trauma on our countries and societies" *(A/71/PV.14, p. 21)*.

More than ever, the problem of asymmetrical threats is becoming a major issue for international peace and security and therefore deserves all the attention that the United Nations and its Member States can give it. The asymmetrical war is becoming even more worrying, since its focus has now expanded beyond traditional State institutions and is also directed at civilians and peacekeepers. Only yesterday, the media informed us of the tragic deaths of a Blue Helmet deployed to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) and two civilians, along with seven others seriously wounded, following an ambush supported by improvised explosive devices. That act of terror brings the number of peacekeepers killed in Mali since 1 January to 35, and MINUSMA's total losses to nearly 70 in the space of three years. My delegation takes this opportunity to honour the memory of the brave soldiers who have sacrificed their lives to protect United Nations values.

Faced with this kind of complex situation, peacekeeping operations must adapt to the local environment. The concept note (S/2016/927, annex) for today's debate outlines some of the relevant measures, which include making peacekeeping operations' mandates more robust and strengthening their operational capacity, along with the capacities of national institutions and stakeholders; training; giving support to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) processes and reforming security sectors.

My country's 12-year experience of hosting a peacekeeping operation, the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire, has taught us that in addition to the aspects I just mentioned, it is vital to stress the importance for such operations, when it comes to fulfilling their mandate, of building close and trusting relationships with the local population. That involves more thorough training regarding the local context and a willingness on the part of United Nations forces to be seen more as a partner for peace and security than a foreign force whose sole task is to lay down the law about people's daily lives. From that viewpoint, focusing on young people, opinion leaders and local notables is a very relevant approach. Peacekeeping operations personnel would also benefit from extensive training in tactics and in joint actions with forces on the ground. The planning of peacekeeping operations should be preceded by an appropriate technical evaluation of the challenges and forces involved, and regular reviews should be conducted once the United Nations force is deployed on the ground.

Dealing effectively with asymmetrical threats in peacekeeping operations also requires close collaboration between the United Nations system, local authorities and non-State actors, and coordination and synergy are determining factors in that regard.

Such collaboration should be supported by regular meetings and information exchanges. Strengthening the operational capacities of the host country's security and defence forces, as well as assistance in educating young people and cooperation with local media, from a preventive point of view, can all contribute to reducing asymmetrical threats. Where measures for consolidating the local security infrastructure are concerned, supporting DDR processes and security-sector reform is equally important. In the case of my country's successful DDR process and security sector reform, the authority in charge of disarmament, demobilization and social reintegration benefited from the assistance of the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire, particularly where marking and storing collected weapons were concerned.

As rightly stressed in the concept note, cooperation between peacekeeping operations and all counter-terrorism institutions and organizations is proving to be critical. In that regard, the Security Council and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations in particular should continue and strengthen their adherence to the recommendations of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and the Secretary General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism. The host country, for its part, must strive to resolve the causes that generated the conflict.

In conclusion, I reiterate my delegation's gratitude for the opportunity to consider this issue of extreme importantce to the entire international community context, and especially to our region, West Africa.

The President (*spoke in French*): I give the floor to the representative of Turkey.

Mr. Begeç (Turkey): I thank you, Sir, for organizing this open debate. I join others in expressing our condemnation of condolences over the attack on the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali.

Turkey greatly values the United Nations peacekeeping efforts and remains committed to supporting them. Peacekeeping operations play a vital role in sustaining political solutions to crises, stabilizing conflicts, decreasing violence and protecting civilians, as well as furthering capacity-building. The 16 currently deployed United Nations missions have a limited scope compared to the total number of conflicts and crisis situations on the United Nations agenda. Peace operations are no match for the peace enforcement measures that can be taken also under Chapter VII.

Special political missions are instrumental in finding political solutions to crises and preventing and peacefully resolving conflicts, including through mediation and sustaining peace as recommended by the recent review processes.Each of these instruments and mechanisms is a critical asset at the disposal of the United Nations, but they must be carefully designed, planned and executed with respect to their specific contexts.

Peacekeeping missions should be deployed on the basis of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. The observance of peacekeeping principles — consent of the host country, impartiality and minimum use of force only for self-defence or defence of the mandate — is essential. Turkey believes that these principles do not preclude protection of civilians, but the primary responsibility for the protection of civilians rests with States in the first place. Nevertheless, it has become a core component of many peacekeeping mandates overtime.

Peacekeeping operations need better adaptability in order to cope with present threats and challenges. Accordingly, United Nations peacekeepers must be better trained, equipped and informed. As long as their safety and security are threatened by asymmetrical threats and terrorist attacks, peacekeepers should be able to defend themselves and their mandate. In that regard, coordination and exchange of information between United Nations peacekeeping missions and counter-terrorism bodies can be undertaken in accordance with their respective and distinct mandates. To that end, we encourage efforts to enhance coordination and coherence among the United Nations counter-terrorism entities in order to better address the threats of terrorism and violent extremism.

However, the recommendation contained in the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations that

> "United Nations peacekeeping missions, owing to their composition and character, are not suited to engage in military counter-terrorism operations" (*S/2015/446, para. 119*)

has to be taken into account before expanding peacekeeping mandates with counter-terrorism tasks. In the same direction, integrating prevention of

violent extremism into the activities of peacekeeping operations and special political missions, as suggested by the Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, should be carefully considered, with all its implications.

Peacekeeping missions might have comparative advantages with regard to capacity-building in rule of law and security sector reform processes that are also considered part of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Indeed, peacekeepers would do better service by increasing their capacity-building activities than by carrying out military counter-terrorism and law enforcement tasks.

Turkey considers the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to be the most appropriate forum to negotiate and develop the necessary framework for United Nations peacekeeping operations, and values the consensual work of the Committee. The triangular cooperation and enhanced consultation among the Security Council, the troop- and police-contributing countries and the Secretariat is the key factor for the better design, planning and execution of peacekeeping mandates as well as other features pertaining to the efficacy of peacekeeping operations.

Before concluding, I pay tribute to all personnel serving under the United Nations banner — ,particularly those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty — for their courage and endurance.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Maldives.

Mr. Sareer (Maldives): Let me begin by congratulating Senegal on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I would also like to thank Minister Nidaye for organizing this timely debate on dealing with asymmetrical threats to peacekeeping missions.

Peacekeeping operations are at the core of the United Nations work and essential to its first and most fundamental missionof maintaining peace and security in all regions of the world. Countless lives have been saved through their work, and countless more have, through them, been given a chance to live more peaceful, more hopeful and more fruitful lives.

The critical element of United Nations peacekeeping operations is the protection of civilians in and from conflict. Therefore, in order to strengthen its work in this function, the Security Council, United Nations agencies and relevant State parties must all accord the protection of civilians commensurate priority in the process of determining the scope and mandate of peacekeeping missions. Their collective work must be guided by a precise and comprehensive framework for identifying threats to civilians in the respective local context, adaptive and flexible strategies for responding to changes in the security environment, and clearly defined objectives.

Such strategies are made even more essential by the increasing prevalence of asymmetrical threats. The existence of asymmetrical threats in a conflict environment is often the result of a convergence of social, economic and political factors. Therefore, while it is essential for peacekeeping missions to be equipped with the appropriate tools to respond to these challenges, these must include mechanisms to ensure peacekeeping missions' legal, technical and monitoring aspects, in addition to physical materiel.

Peacekeeping missions must first and foremost be afforded adequate personnel and staff to implement their mandate. Likewise, the core goals and unique aspects of mission mandates should be reflected in their training courses. The relevant principles of international humanitarian law, and international law in general, must become an integral part of national training for peacekeepers in order to ensure they are respected. This is necessary if we are to ensure that their efforts against asymmetrical threats will not only be effective, but remain consistent with the fundamental principles of peacekeeping: consent of the parties, impartiality and non-use of force except in self-defence and defence of the mandate.

It is also critical to actively monitor and review the progress of peacekeepers at the individual level, and peacekeeping missions at the organizational level, in order to ensure progress is being made in the fulfillment of their mandate. In this regard, the Maldives welcomes the introduction of new indicators to better evaluate the performance of peacekeeping missions and to enhance their effectivencss, as recommended in the report of the Secretary-General.

It is important to ensure that if efforts on the ground are to be delivered effectively, they be coherent with the programmes and plans being run by various agencies. There is also a lot of scope for Member States, regional organizations and domestic agencies to coordinate towards better information-sharing and

knowledge-sharing. Such collaboration would go far in making our efforts effective as well.

It is not merely the Maldives' hope, but our firm conviction that each and every State Member of the United Nations should do its utmost to ensure the fulfillment of its aspirations to peace and security, as laid out in the Charter of the United Nations, and thus the success of its peacekeeping operations. This conviction should only become stronger when faced with emerging operational challenges. In doing so, we must hold ourselves to the highest standards, mindful of this common cause and shared endeavour, to which we have all committed in the Charter. If we remain fully cognizant of what we aim to achieve and what this requires of us, we are convinced that we shall succeed.

The President (*spoke in French*): I give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. Estreme (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank the delegation of Senegal for convening today's open debate and the briefers for their presentations.

The Security Council has increasingly deployed peacekeeping operations in complex environments with non-State armed groups that use asymmetrical terrorist tactics against the United Nations, thereby causing a rising number of casualties among the Organization's staff. My country honours those who have given their lives in the service of peace. We condemn the murders and other acts of violence committed against peacekeepers. We stress the need to develop more effective security measures for peace missions.

There is no doubt that peacekeeping operations should be endowed with the means required to guarantee the safety of their staff and equipment, enabling them to effectively discharge their mandates, and in particular to ensure the protection of civilians who are also the targets of asymmetrical threats. Amid such measures and on the basis of the considerations of both the Report of the High-level Panel on Peace Operations (see S/2015/446) and today's interesting concept note (see S/2016/927, annex), Argentina considers it important to highlight the following: first, the specific equipment and training capabilities needed to defend against asymmetrical threats and the special financing required to acquire them; secondly, the development of special training manuals by the Secretariat in close consultation with the States Members of the United Nations; thirdly, a suitable operations concept and clear and specific rules of engagement for operational environments with asymmetrical threats; fourthly, a mandate that includes elements needed for capacity-building and peacebuilding in host countries, in particular assistance in rebuilding their national security institutions, especially in the areas of the rule of law and security sector reform, in line with the new goal of sustaining peace; fifthly, the use of new technologies, including unmanned aerial vehicles, in order to maximize operational knowledge of the situation, without prejudice to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations or to the principles of peacekeeping; sixthly, the strengthening of institutional cooperation and the sharing of information among United Nations counter-terrorism entities, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Political Affairs and peacekeeping operations, using the tools that the Organization already possesses.

As highlighted in the interesting concept note drafted by Senegal, it is one thing to give peacekeepers the tools with which to protect themselves and civilians against asymmetrical threats and quite another to have them engaged in counter-terrorism efforts in areas where peacekeeping missions are deployed. In that regard, Argentina reiterates its position, which is in line with that outlined in the Report of the High-level Panel on Peace Operations, which states that peacekeeping operations were not designed, trained or equipped to impose political solutions through the sustained use of force of an offensive nature. Peacekeeping operations are therefore not an appropriate instrument for conducting military counter-terrorism operations.

We understand that there are more effective counter-terrorism tools which, at the same time, enable the principles of peacekeeping operations to be safeguarded and to serve as guidelines for peace operations processes, above and beyond their peacekeeping mandates. In that way, the essence of such mandates are not distorted by the introduction of elements that impose peace and are foreign to peacekeeping. In that regard and in conclusion, Argentina is ready to engage in discussion on such tools, not only in the Security Council but also in the wider forum of the General Assembly and, in particular, in the Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

The President (*spoke in French*): I give the floor to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Mr. Mounzer (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country's delegation would like to pay tribute to the good relations that exist between Syria, the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) and other peace operations. We would like to reiterate the Government's commitment to supporting the mission with all possible tools.

As everyone knows, peacekeeping operations in any region should be for a brief transitional period. However, and unfortunately, in the Middle East that period is often measured in decades. That is because of Israel's continued occupation of Arab territory, posing a challenge to the resolutions of international legitimacy, and its ongoing aggressive policies that threaten the region's peace and security. In that regard, I recall that the Israeli occupation of Arab territory is the reason for United Nations peace operations missions in the region, which is a burden on the United Nations budget and human resources.

My delegation would like to express its deep concern about the security threats and attacks on peacekeepers. My delegation would like to stress that such attacks are the major challenges posed to peacekeeping operations. In that regard, I note the statement made by the representative of Israel and wish to offer some comments. He stated that troops kidnapped security personnel in the Golan, which proves that Israel is supporting terrorist groups. The terrorist group, Al-Nusrah Front, kidnapped and expelled UNDOF elements from the region. That terrorist organization, which is on the international terrorist organizations list and has paid visits to the Israeli Prime Minister and to those in hospital, has received all forms of support from Israel, within the framework of UNDOF. Israel allows the tanks of the terrorist groups, including Al-Nusrah, to target innocent people in Al-Qunaytirah, which is very close to the border in Jaulan. I have with me a photo of Mira Zidane, who was two-and-a-half years old when she was killed by Al-Nusrah missiles close to the border while she was at home.

Israeli support of the terrorist group Al-Nusrah is very well known on that border region and documented in UNDOF reports. According to the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for the period from 21 May to 29 August,

> "Further south, United Nations personnel at observation post 54 on 1 and 29 June observed Israel Defense Forces vehicles moving from the Alpha side to the ceasefire line where Israel Defense Forces personnel disembarked the vehicles and unloaded items immediately east of the ceasefire line and thereafter returning to the Alpha side. Several individuals in trucks from the Bravo side subsequently arrived at the location where the items had been left and loaded the items on the trucks and drove off in an easterly direction." (*S/2016/803, para. 10*)

There is a second reference to this in the report of the Secretary-General on UNDOF for the period from 1 March to 20 May 2016:

> "Crossing of the ceasefire line by civilians, primarily shepherds, from the Bravo side to the Alpha side was observed on an almost daily basis. On a number of occasions on 9, 10 and 28 March and 11 April, United Nations personnel at observation post 54 observed interaction at the Israeli technical fence between the Israel Defense Forces personnel and individuals from the Bravo side, some of whom were armed." (*S/2016/520, para. 5*)

The President (*spoke in French*): The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has asked for the floor to make a further statement. I now call on him.

Mr. Safaei (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have asked for the floor to react to the statement made by the representative of the Israeli regime during this debate, which was totally irrelevant to the subject of the debate, namely, facing asymmetrical threats to peace operations. That representative chose not to talk about the daily violations of resolution 1701 (2006), as documented in many reports submitted to the Council. Instead, he once again levelled some baseless and fabricated accusations against my Government in his statement to the Council.

I take this opportunity to categorically reject those accusations, which have been repeated many times in the past and each time without a shred of evidence to substantiate those accusations. Apparently, his delegation assumes that the mere repetition of an accusation may make it acceptable and believable by part of the audience. Not only is that assumption wrong, but also the repetition of those baseless accusations is repugnant and repulsive. Israel just hopes that, by repeating the allegations against Iran, it can cover up its crimes against Palestinian civilians and distract the international community from the scourge of its

occupation of the Palestinian and Arab lands for so many decades and its crimes in suppressing the rights of the whole nation. What Israel has so far done in attacking Iran did not serve this purpose and, no doubt, it will not in the future.

The President (*spoke in French*): There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.